

---

**RESULTS REVIEW AND RESOURCE REQUEST (R4) FY 2000**

**REGIONAL CENTER FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA**

**MARCH 1998**



**Regional Integration Through  
Partnership and Participation**

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
<b>Part I: Overview and Factors Affecting Program Performance</b> .....	1
<b>Part II: Progress Towards Objectives</b> .....	8
Introduction .....	8
Strategic Objective One: Increased Regional Capacity to Influence Democratic Performance .....	11
Strategic Objective Two: A More Integrated Regional Market .....	20
Strategic Objective Three: Accelerated Regional Adoption of Sustainable Agriculture and Natural Resource Management Approaches .....	33
Special Objective A: Increased Regional Capacity to Manage Transboundary Natural Resources .....	42
Special Objective B: Create Capacity for More Informed Regional Decision Making .....	48
Environmental Compliance .....	53
<b>Part III: Status of Management Contract</b> .....	54
<b>Appendices</b>	
Appendix A - Regional Analysis on the Issue of HIV/AIDS .....	60
Appendix B - Strategy Linkage to Mission Performance Plans .....	61
Appendix C - Performance Tables .....	62
<b>Part IV: Resource Request</b> .....	63
1. Financial Plan .....	63
2. Prioritization of Objectives .....	64
3. Field Support .....	65
4. Workforce and Operating Expenses (OE) FY 1998-2000 Operating Expense Budgets and Workforce Requirements .....	65
<b>Part IV Annexes</b>	
1. Program Budget Tables	
2. Field Support Table	
3. OE Budget Tables	
4. Workforce Tables	

## Part I

### Overview and Factors Affecting Program Performance

**U.S. Interests in Southern Africa:** A peaceful, democratic and economically integrated Southern Africa enjoying sustainable economic growth and steadily improving living conditions for its 140 million citizens is the widely-supported vision to which Southern Africa has committed itself by treaty and, more important, by action. Southern African success in regional collaboration on a wide range of key developmental areas is measurably contributing to the probability that this vision will be achieved. Increasing the ability of the region's own institutions, such as the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and the SADC Parliamentary Forum, is key to successful management of intra-regional disputes and conflicts.

A strong, successful and self-confident Southern Africa will not only benefit its own peoples, but will also have a profoundly stabilizing influence throughout the African continent. Just as a Southern Africa able to police its own conflicts becomes an asset to U.S. security rather than a potential liability, an economically successful Southern Africa able to play effectively in the global economy becomes a solid economic asset bearing no resemblance to the outdated caricature of the "African basket case."

**The New RCSA Strategy:** USAID early recognized the potential contribution of Southern Africa to U.S. security, prosperity and other national interests in its ground breaking 1994 Initiative for Southern Africa (ISA). The ISA envisaged a targeted program contributing to sustainable regional economic growth characterized by democratic forms of governance. The RCSA Strategy approved in August 1997, gives substance to this 1997-2003 vision.

The Strategy contributes to achieving the ISA goal of equitable sustainable economic growth in a democratic Southern Africa by addressing constraints which lend themselves to regional approaches. It is oriented toward objectives of achieving policy change, creating new partnerships and institutional arrangements, piloting new ways of operating regionally and spreading the word on best practices. In short, it seeks to influence *policies, approaches and attitudes*, largely by creating new options and models for consideration by regional and national entities and governments across Southern Africa.

The new Strategy includes three Strategic and two Special Objectives, each regional in nature:

***Strategic Objective 1: Increased Regional Capacity to Influence Democratic Performance*** contributes to improving democratic practices and building regional institutions which bolster and sustain democratic progress. Intermediate results under the long-term strategy's Democracy and Governance (DG) SO focus on forms of regional influence on political attitudes -- such as information dissemination, advocacy and norms-setting -- which can be effected in many different sectors. This approach reflects RCSA's view that the key factor in increasing regional DG influence is to increase the range and volume of regional DG interactions, and that sectoral focuses are unnecessarily confining, particularly at this early and fluid stage of regional institutional development.

***Strategic Objective 2: A More Integrated Regional Market*** enhances prospects for economic growth in the region by assisting in

the integration of a regional market. This new SO recognizes the importance of reducing barriers to trade and investment, developing regional infrastructure and the need for strong advocates for regional integration.

***Strategic Objective 3: Accelerated Regional Adoption of Sustainable Agriculture and Natural Resource Management (Ag/NRM) Approaches*** increases the utilization of sustainable and productivity-enhancing technologies by smallholders, while encouraging the sustainable management of the environment. Emphasis in the agriculture and natural resources management areas has shifted toward disseminating appropriate technology packages, while encouraging the policy changes needed to provide market incentives for adoption of these packages.

***Special Objective A: Increased Regional Capacity to Manage Transboundary Natural Resources*** promotes better understanding and management of shared resources such as water, migratory wildlife, parks and associated ecosystems. Under this Special Objective, RCSA will research the area of transboundary natural resources to determine whether developments in the region warrant a strategic objective for this sector.

***Special Objective B: Create Capacity for More Informed Regional Decision Making*** develops a coherent and wide-ranging data and information base on which RCSA and regional actors can properly weigh regional goals in policy-making and assess progress toward mutually agreed-upon targets and benchmarks. This Special Objective will also allow RCSA to examine the area of regional decision-making and determine whether Southern Africans are willing to take ownership of a participatory process of defining a regional

vision and monitoring progress toward achieving key development objectives.

Implementation of this Strategy began in earnest over this last year. In keeping with the original ISA policy mandate, implementation has been built around participation of a wide range of partners and stakeholders. RCSA has consulted actively on design and implementation issues with members of the donor community, Embassy representatives from non-presence countries, and USAID policy and technical experts from Washington and the field. Even more important, however, has been the continuing participation in RCSA decision-making by our Southern African partners, including not only major inter-governmental entities such as SADC but also representatives of the business community, academia, public sector organizations and NGOs. The early results of this phase of Strategy implementation are reported in the pages that follow.

### **Regional Developments Over the Year**

***A generally successful year for the region.*** Over the past year, important changes in Southern Africa have affected RCSA's activities. Overall, the story has been one of progress and success in continuing economic and political reform, and reaffirmation of the value of regional approaches. Particularly notable has been the continuing political commitment to regional integration and "community-building," consistently validating the choices made and directions charted by the new RCSA Strategy.

Most countries continued to build and strengthen their democratic institutions, despite troubling authoritarian backsliding in Zambia and a halt in Swaziland's move toward constitutional government. Even Zimbabwe's

rapid and severe political and economic deterioration, while alarming, reflected a powerful popular rejection of undemocratic rule and hinted at a far earlier end to the current regime than was thinkable even a year ago. A new readiness to speak out for democratic values was evidenced most dramatically in President Mandela's condemnation of the repressive practices of the Zambian and Swazi governments at the August SADC Summit. Moreover, civil society and governmental figures in the region sought to influence political developments more frequently and publicly than ever before, while once-effective attempts to avoid condemnation through appeals to solidarity or national sovereignty met with little, if any, sympathy.

The macroeconomic climate in the SADC region improved significantly as well, an encouraging sign for continuing the momentum for regional integration. Average GDP growth increased from 3 percent in 1994 to 4.1 percent in 1996, with the expected 1997 growth rate increasing to 6 percent. Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) as a share of GDP also increased, more than doubling from 1.1 percent in 1995 to 2.7 percent in 1996; FDI is expected to more than double again to 6 percent of GDP in 1997. Southern Africa remained Africa's fastest-growing region, accounting for 60 percent (\$300 billion) of total sub-Saharan GDP. At \$990 per capita, regional GDP per capita was double that of the sub-Saharan average.

Inflation is declining from the double digits formerly typical in the region. In 1996, seven countries had inflation rates between 6 and 12 percent; inflation in Tanzania (at 21 percent) and Zimbabwe (35 percent) was high, but lower than in 1995. (Zimbabwean inflation is likely to have risen again in 1997 due to the end-of-year economic collapse, however.) Fiscal deficits were reduced to 6 percent of GDP or less throughout most of the SADC

region, with still lower rates expected for 1997.

Substantial investment continued to pour into the region to improve and expand its key economic infrastructure. Completion of the Trans-Kalahari Highway created a direct overland route from Mozambique's Port of Maputo to Walvis Bay in Namibia, providing the Gauteng region, by far the most industrialized area of South Africa, with easy access to a second port in the Atlantic Ocean. Private sector firms submitted bids for managing the railroad line from the Port of Beira to Harare, Zimbabwe -- "the Beira Corridor." These bids are in the process of being reviewed and an award is expected later this year. In addition, the Port of Beira continued with its concessioning program which allows private sector firms to manage key aspects of the Port. In connection with the Maputo Corridor, the TransAfrican Concessions Consortium plans to begin construction of a \$400 million toll road between Witbank and Maputo in April 1998. South Africa's Telkom, the largest telecommunications operator in the region, selected a prominent U.S. company (SBC, formerly SouthWestern Bell Corporation) as a strategic partner, leading a trend toward greater U.S. private sector participation in telecommunications operations throughout the region.

There continued to be great interest in and commitment to moving forward on trade reform. While the proliferation of proposed trade regimes in the region created conflicting priorities and confusion, and strained government trade departments' limited human capacity, ways were found to move ahead where the political will existed for trade liberalization and integration. Zambia, for example, successfully concluded a preferential, non-reciprocal trade agreement with SACU

which affords it easier access to the South African market.

While bracing itself for a devastating drought resulting from El Niño, heavy rains since January have permitted significant crop recovery in much of the region. Though many fears of crippling maize deficit and drought in much of the region have been reduced, pockets of high risk zones do exist. Surprisingly, Malawi has even been forecast to increase its maize output by 29 percent this season.

Several countries have made considerable progress in including rural dwellers in the decision-making process on the management of natural resources. In particular, Botswana and Namibia are in the process of approving policies empowering communities to directly manage natural resources.

The region has seen a dramatic expansion in electronic connectivity and networks, in civil society in particular, comparable to the extraordinary speed with which fax communication was adopted earlier in the decade. In the agricultural and natural resources sector, for example, this is permitting a more rapid exchange of research results and best practices among institutions, PVOs/NGOs, scientists and others, permitting better access not only to Southern African resources but also to the global knowledge base. These connections are directly linked to the increased availability of appropriate technology and the rapidly growing numbers of community-based natural resources management projects around the region.

**Implementing the Regional Vision.** An equally important phenomenon has been the growing evidence of genuine political commitment to a shared agenda of regional integration and collaborative problem-solving. Southern Africa's vision of regional

cooperation is not new: its antecedents reach back over thirty years to formation of the Front-Line States grouping opposing the South African apartheid regime. What has shown itself in particularly encouraging ways during the past year is increasing evidence of political will to attack obstacles in order to make the "regional project" succeed. During the past year, this was seen in:

- ratification of the SADC Trade Protocol by three of its twelve signatories (*In this R4, unless otherwise specified, the term SADC refers to the twelve countries which were members in August 1997, when RCSA long-term Strategy was approved.*);
- increasing rejection of an ASEAN-style ethos of "non-interference in internal affairs," was heard more frequently in internal SADC discussions as well as individual governmental condemnation of the undemocratic actions of others;
- readiness to address contentious issues cooperatively and through direct discussion, as in the Botswana-Namibia disputes over Okavango water and (quietly facilitated by SADC) border fences; and
- South Africa's acceptance that it cannot unilaterally negotiate a Free Trade Agreement with the European Union (EU) but rather must engage with its neighbors on the potential impact of such an Agreement on their interests.

However resilient and vibrant the vision and the political will, there remains a critical "implementation gap" created by the limited number of institutional actors and mechanisms for implementing the regional vision. Institutional mechanisms at both inter-governmental and non-governmental levels have generally lacked the legitimacy or authority to define concrete programs of action

and carry out regional programs; few possess the capacity to design and promote ambitious and effective plans for regional action. In addition, data simply do not exist; and other information needed to design effective programs exists, but is poorly disseminated.

In particular, the core institution charged with effecting regional development -- SADC -- has only limited authority, staff capacity and data on which to build programs. It enjoys little institutional autonomy, with policymaking limited to meetings of the Heads of State and Government and the Council of Ministers. Most substantive work is handled by sectoral coordinating units located in member states' government bureaucracies and dependent on their resources or technical committees.

This relatively barren institutional landscape is, however, changing quickly. Over the past year, RCSA has seen a tremendous range of regional collaboration initiatives being taken across Southern Africa. In the SADC context alone, one sees:

- development of the SADC Protocols as a promising mechanism for negotiating and implementing coordinated policy change throughout the entire region;
- ever-more active discussion of and experimentation with institutional reform (redesign of SACCAR and other sectoral units; consideration of shifting country responsibility for individual sectors to central units; a three-president commission to consider options for increasing the effectiveness of the SADC Organ on Politics, Defence and Security);
- establishment of the SADC Parliamentary Forum, representing the first formal SADC structure constituted to represent the voice of the people, not the executive branch, of member states;

- NGO collaboration to establish an effective SADC Council of NGOs to serve as an interlocutor with SADC on NGO interests and ensure that NGO views are adequately weighed in SADC councils; and
- establishment of the SADC Border Post Operations Working Group and other similar organizations which have brought business sector representatives into the process of defining and implementing policy and procedural reforms needed to reduce delays and other impediments to cross-border operations.

Outside SADC the picture is equally vital:

- SACU is actively reaching out beyond its current five members, offering an alternative route to achieving a regional free trade zone which could conceivably supersede SADC's own initiatives;
- COMESA has been revitalized and continues to pursue trade liberalization and implement trade facilitation measures throughout Southern and Eastern Africa;
- the Maputo Corridor brings public and private sectors together in building an integrated transportation corridor between South Africa's industrial heartland and Maputo, the closest major port; associated with this initiative are transportation spurs to Swaziland and exploration of common tourism initiatives including, most recently, consideration of a special three-country tourist visa for the area;
- civil society has also begun to organize on a regional basis, whether among NGOs (where press and human rights organizations in particular have taken the lead in regional cooperation), academia/think tanks (notably the Harare-based Southern Africa Regional Institute

for Policy Studies and Southern Africa Research and Documentation Centre) or business (industry groupings such as the Southern African Regional Freight Forwarders Association);

- the Media Institute of Southern Africa is showing tremendous effectiveness in voicing a common regional agenda for press freedom through a proactive regional headquarters and vibrant national chapters;
- the Zimbabwe Chamber of Commerce has initiated a program of trade missions within the region designed to exploit regional business opportunities on a systematic basis;
- the Southern African Human Rights NGO Network has begun to take coordinated stands, and lobby directly with the SADC Summit, on human rights and DG developments within countries throughout the region;
- governments, NGOs and communities involved in community-based natural resources management projects, through regular meetings or electronic communication, have begun to come together on a routine basis to share best practices, lessons learned and other information deriving from the wide range of community based natural resource management initiatives underway in several countries of the region;
- taking advantage of information technologies, networks have grown up of institutions, PVOs/NGOs, and individual scientists interested in exchanging research results and creating better access not only to Southern African resources but also to the global knowledge base; these connections are directly linked to the increased availability of appropriate

technology and the rapidly growing numbers of community-based natural resources management projects around the region; and

- the International Union for the Conservation of Nature's Regional Office for Southern Africa has established a network of private and public sector contacts throughout the region which is providing technology exchange, training and policy guidance in the area of natural resource management.

It is in this context that RCSA's new Strategy offers much promise. Events over the last year reinforce our belief that USAID has a perhaps historic opportunity to help translate Southern Africa's vision of regional integration into a reality and helping Southern Africans design and apply tools for implementing regional programs. As the *only* major donor entity focussing exclusively on regional programs, RCSA is uniquely placed to play this role: the new Strategy devotes RCSA's full attention and resources to understanding what is required to succeed and to contributing directly to meeting those needs.

### **Key Constraints to RCSA Strategy Implementation:**

As reported in the following pages, substantial progress has been made in launching the new Strategy. However, achievement of concrete results has been seriously impeded by the following key constraints:

***Lack of Institutional Mechanisms.*** RCSA seeks to strengthen and expand the range of entities capable of operating effectively at a regional level, and is committed to working through Southern African entities rather than simply "buying expertise" from overseas; by the same token, the relative paucity of such focused and experienced local institutions



means that results involving them will not be immediate.

**Coordination.** Because RCSA genuinely believes that Southern Africa already possesses the great bulk of the human and other resources required to chart and create its own political and economic future, the Center is profoundly committed to the "Southern African-led, Southern African-driven" principles underlying the ISA. Whether through the Project Committee of the Southern Africa Regional Democracy Fund (SARDF), or the consultations giving rise to the long-term Strategy, or the Southern African Transport and Communication Commission's close collaboration with the private sector in developing model transport and telecommunications legislation, RCSA considers it essential for its program's success that its Southern African partners not only accept, but own and play guiding roles in all

its activities. Given the challenges of obtaining such active buy-in from partners spread from Cape Town to Zanzibar, however, this process is also necessarily a time-consuming one.

**Staffing Shortages.** As more fully discussed in Part IV, implementation and monitoring of RCSA program has been seriously and negatively affected by the lack of required staff and, in particular, of adequate RCO resources. The impact of RCO shortages is exaggerated for the Regional Center by the fact that RCSA is not working in a bilateral context with a single host government, and by the otherwise-welcome ISA mandate that RCSA work in close partnership with NGOs as well as governments: the consequence of both is that an even higher proportion of our work than might otherwise be the case requires continual attention and action from already short handed contracting office.

## Part II

### Progress Towards Objectives

**Introduction:** The ISA sets forth the goal of promoting equitable sustainable economic growth in a democratic Southern Africa. RCSA's Strategy contributes to achieving this goal through three Strategic and two Special Objectives.

**Strategic Objective 1: Increased Regional Capacity to Influence Democratic Performance.** Substantive progress under this SO met RCSA's expectations on both the SO and IR levels, with significant evidence of growth potential for regional influence and that RCSA-supported activities are making positive contributions to national debates over DG issues throughout the region. Reporting efforts met RCSA expectations only at the SO level, however, with IR information remaining largely anecdotal in nature. Management energies in the year beginning with approval of the long-term Strategy in August 1997 are being dedicated to reshaping the SARDF activity, carried over from the start-up framework, to take best advantage of the greatly improved strategic direction and to maximize resources dedicated to program rather than administration.

**Strategic Objective 2: A More Integrated Regional Market.** Performance in this SO, which has activities in transportation and telecommunications infrastructure improvement which pre-dated but are consistent with the current Strategy, exceeded expectations. USAID has significantly contributed to visible results in advancing trade and telecommunications and transportation protocols which are preconditions to regional market integration. Progress in other programs has been satisfactory but can be improved. In order to improve results, corrective actions are being taken in the Regional Technical Assistance

Activity and Southern Africa Enterprise Development Fund (SAEDF).

**Strategic Objective 3: Accelerated Regional Adoption of Sustainable Agriculture and Natural Resource Management.** While progress in identifying and designing activities to support the new strategic focus of SO3 has been slow, significant advances have been realized with the continuing activities from the interim strategy. Of note are acceptance and use by farmers in the region of new, more productive seed for growing millet and sorghum and increased planting of new varieties of sweet potatoes and cassava that are drought resistant. Communities in the region are being given the responsibility to manage the use of natural resources. The region is communicating better through a number of SO3-developed networks bringing researchers, government institutions and NGOs into contact for sharing information, transferring technology and policy discussions.

**Special Objective A: Increased Regional Capacity to Manage Transboundary Natural Resources.** Baseline gathering and situation analysis activities were completed satisfactorily. Activities contribute to clarification of the objective while also assisting with regional needs, such as collaboratively identifying training needs relative to developing and implementing water protocols.

**Special Objective B: Create Capacity for More Informed Regional Decision Making.** Under this objective, RCSA's top priority during the first year following approval of the Strategy has been to operationalize the impact monitoring and evaluation system for the new Regional Strategy, which is Phase I. Work

has focused on designing indicators, baseline and performance targets at the sub-goal, strategic objective, special objective and intermediate result levels, as reflected in this Report. Progress is satisfactory, although serious contracting delays meant crucial data collection efforts got a late start.

In addition, RCSA has learned valuable lessons which will contribute significantly to refinement of the system in the current year. In particular, analysis of data, some collected for the first time, will permit RCSA to refine targets by the next R4 submission. Components of Phase II, related to the expansion of capacity among Southern Africans for informed regional decision making, will begin late in the current year.

**Data Constraints:** 1) Distortions -- Besides usual data table challenges of collection, accuracy and attribution, regional indicators for Southern Africa pose two significant problems. First, in many cases, results are distorted by the presence of South Africa, whose economy and sectoral development

dwarf the rest of the region. Including South Africa in tables can skew statistics and imply region-wide trends that do not exist. Second, unified regional statistics do not portray varying degrees of progress among the SADC countries. Therefore, in future years, the SO teams may isolate South Africa in some tables to show its effect on the data. In others instances, descriptive case studies where countries are making progress at varying rates may be used. 2) Data Deficiencies -- Availability of reliable data varies among sectors for countries. Generally, data on trade have been most difficult to obtain from Tanzania and Angola. Trade data that are collected reflect formal trade and does not take into account informal cross-border trade. Socio-economic data on urbanization, AIDS, etc., vary in utility from country to country. Special Objective B will assist RCSA in determining the existence or dearth of regional data and examine ways to collaboratively improve on data sources and analytical capacity to inform regional policy making.

### Summary Table

Objective Name	Rating
<i>SO1: Increased Regional Capacity to Influence Democratic Performance</i>	Met Expectations
<i>SO2: A More Integrated Regional Market</i>	Exceeded Expectations
<i>SO3: Accelerated Regional Adoption of Sustainable Agriculture and Natural Resource Management Approaches</i>	Met Expectations
<i>SpOA: Increased Regional Capacity to Manage Transboundary Natural Resources</i>	Met Expectations
<i>SpOB: Create Capacity for More Informed Regional Decision Making</i>	Met Expectations
Percent funding through NGOs and PVOs: FY 1998 28%; FY 1999 22%; FY 2000 26%	

No substantive evaluations occurred during 1997; however, findings from case studies and analytical reports are discussed in the SO narratives.

## **Strategic Objective 1:**

### **Increased Regional Capacity to Influence Democratic Performance**

#### **Purpose and Background of the Objective:**

This Strategic Objective builds on experience gained in implementing RCSA's predecessor start-up democracy and governance "framework," the Southern Africa Regional Democracy Fund (SARDF), and on extensive consultations with the SARDF Project Committee and scores of Southern African organizations. The objective is built on four key premises: 1) taken collectively, sufficient resources of talent, experience, knowledge and political commitment exist within Southern Africa for the region's democracies to be self-sustaining; 2) crucial cultural values supportive of democracy are more widely shared than is commonly recognized even in the region; 3) Southern Africans cannot and do not ignore the views of other Southern Africans and 4) because backsliding on democratic progress benefits few while damaging the region as a whole, regional influences will consistently weigh in favor of preservation and promotion of democracy.

This Objective accordingly aims at increasing the weight of regional factors in national political debates around Southern Africa. It seeks to empower DG advocates both to draw on the full range of the region's experience and lessons learned as they work to institutionalize their democracies, and to act most effectively in opposing the shortsighted backsliding which is the greatest threat to that process. It does so through improved and expanded information sharing across borders (IR1), through promotion of regional and national-level advocacy bringing regional perspectives and experience to bear on national political discourse (IR2), and through support for Southern African efforts to explore

and agree on common norms of democratic behavior in a wide range of spheres (IR3).

SO1's substantive focus is on changing attitudes and values. Its essential method is to promote effective networking. Grants such as those for internet connections among national NGO umbrellas, reinvigoration of the SADC Council of NGOs or development of human rights information and advocacy networks are all aimed at helping common interest groupings to identify shared needs and potential, and to facilitate their continuing communication of ideas, information and support. In addition, the SARDF Project Committee, made up of two citizens from each of the eleven countries covered by SO1, is itself an increasingly important forum for exchange of views and information and mechanism for promoting networking and regional cooperation.

RCSA implements SO1 through two activities: 1) SARDF, under which grants, primarily for programmatic purposes, are made to Southern African entities working to promote democratic values, practices and institutions regionwide, and 2) Strengthening Regional Economies Through NGOs (STRENGTH), under which grants are made for capacity-building of NGO partners under RCSA Strategic and Special Objectives.

**Progress To Date:** The overall trend in 1997 was of continued firming of Southern Africa's democratic character, but that trend was by no means universal, and the task of building a "cluster of well-functioning democracies" in Southern Africa is far from complete. Despite some distinct problems, several countries --

notably Mozambique, Namibia and South Africa -- generally continued their successful institutionalization of sound democratic practices. A disputed election, a failed coup and arrests of and treason indictments against scores of government opponents presented a grim picture in Zambia, however, and economic crisis, labor unrest and increasingly erratic government behavior raise serious and urgent questions about the stability and future direction of Zimbabwe.

A critical positive development, however, is that the region has responded to these events with an increasingly robust defense of democracy and condemnation of backsliding. At the regional level, it is clear that Southern African governments and civil society consider developments in neighboring countries very much their business, commenting with clarity and pointedness about the need to conform to democratic standards. This welcome change from earlier post-colonial practice was reflected in increasingly visible tensions within

politically knowledgeable Southern Africans in ten countries; the views and knowledge of this group were seen as best reflecting those of political opinion-formers in the region. These participants are well aware of major democracy and governance developments in Southern Africa, and relate them to their own situations. Almost every focus group had clear and well-informed ideas about DG lessons their countries can teach or learn from others.

Some, such as the Namibian group, felt they had much more to offer than to learn. Others, such as the Swazi and Zimbabwean groups, were profoundly dissatisfied with their own systems; these looked to Botswana, for example, for its effective incorporation of traditional structures, or Namibia and South Africa for their participatory constitutional development processes. Zimbabwe, sadly, was seen as an exemplar of what not to do, particularly with regard to corruption, abuse of power and lack of transparency.

---

#### **MISA Regional Legal Defense Fund**

RCSA-supported MISA Regional Legal Defense Fund has supported the independent press in defamation cases brought by ministers in Lesotho, in challenging the Tanzania's Broadcasting Act's restrictions on private radio stations and in defending against charges of "wrongful reporting" brought against journalists for a story written in a now-defunct Botswana newspaper.

---

SADC between South Africa's President Mandela and others favoring an explicit human rights and democratic agenda and those preferring to maintain traditional reluctance to intervene in members' domestic political systems.

Initial research results confirm the potential for substantial regional impact on national democratic debates. In order to establish a baseline for overall regional influence, focus group interviews were conducted with

Although the institutions through which that influence can be exercised remain few and underdeveloped, some regional organizations have begun to show real effectiveness. The Media Institute of Southern Africa (MISA) is the leading example of how a regional body can organize, produce and distribute relevant information, foster development of common positions and standards and advocate effectively at both regional and national levels. Women's groups such as Women in Law and Development in Southern Africa (WILDAF), although still effective, have generally focused more at the local level following intense regional cooperation in the buildup to the Beijing conference. RCSA support has helped both the Inter-African Network for Human Rights (AFRONET) and the Southern African Human Rights NGO Network (SAHRINGON) to become increasingly effective in expanding the timely distribution of accurate human rights information within the region, in

coordinating common region-wide interventions with respect to human rights violations in SADC countries, and in placing human rights and DG issues on SADC's and the wider regional agenda.

With respect to *Intermediate Result 1*, "Increased Information Sharing Within the Region," the amount of democracy and governance information available on other countries varies widely. General reporting on regional events in the media is fairly good, although South Africa is over-reported and Lesotho, Malawi and Swaziland distinctly under-reported. The quality of such general reporting is noticeably improving with increasing use of stories distributed through RCSA grantees MISA, InterPress Service and Africa Information Afrique. In 1997, the press focused on South Africa, particularly the Truth and Reconciliation Commission; issues of Zimbabwean corruption and abuse of governmental power; and Zambia's failed coup and heavy-handed government attacks on the media and opposition.

Reporting on anti-democratic actions elsewhere is often quite pointed, particularly when there is a perceived domestic parallel. In reporting on Zimbabwean developments, for example, *The Namibian* condemned President Mugabe's failure to deal with a highly credible and critical report on the 1985 Matabeleland massacres, and contrasted Mugabe's unwillingness to deal with succession issues with the planned retirements of Botswana's and South Africa's presidents in favor of strong, competent and clearly-designated successors. It is difficult not to read these reports as also commenting on Namibian President Nujoma's refusal to discuss credible reports of pre-independence SWAPO torture of detainees and on Nujoma's failure to groom a successor and plans to modify Namibia's constitution to permit himself a third term.

South African papers generally carried few stories -- and even fewer of a detailed or positive nature -- on events elsewhere in the region, and South Africans generally were unaware of events beyond their borders. Other countries are comparably insular in their reporting on external events, but the disproportion of inward and outward influence in South Africa's case is exaggerated by the widespread availability of South African news through papers and other sources outside that country, and contrasting near-total unavailability of other-country papers in South Africa.

The most critical gap which IR1 seeks to address, however, is in the detailed information and analysis required for effective advocacy or policy development. Obtaining detailed information and, especially, analysis of specific democracy and governance initiatives elsewhere in the region remains difficult; recipients of such information from RCSA-supported entities consider it at once critical to their work and inadequate in both volume and timeliness. Other sources of information range from word-of-mouth to the internet. Although many bemoan the continuing domination of non-African sources of news on the region, in even the least "wired" countries the internet is rapidly becoming a key tool for obtaining and exchanging accurate, relevant and up-to-date information. A well-received RCSA grant to fund trained internet researchers in six national NGO umbrella organizations to facilitate regional cooperation through electronic means and a grant to the Institute for Multi-Party Democracy to create a regional directory of NGOs active in DG issues both aim to facilitate the contacts among specialist peer entities needed to ensure the effective transfer of topical information. A new grant to the Southern Africa Research and Documentation Center (SARDC) will increase awareness of and access to one of Southern Africa's most important sources of research data on DG and

related issues. One focus group participant perhaps optimistically predicted that in "the next four or five years we will see most information on or about Southern Africa emanating from the subregion, and that information will be viewed as increasingly credible."

Whatever the perceived limitations in availability of information, Southern Africans are making good use of it in advocacy campaigns. This bodes well for *Intermediate Result 2*, "Increased Advocacy and Cooperation Bringing Regional Experience to Bear at National Level." Although available information does not permit ascription of significant results specifically to advocacy funded by RCSA, beneficiary surveys and focus groups make clear that most of the regional entities supported by RCSA are recognized as leaders in effective advocacy, and that RCSA has a relationship with a majority of the most effective democracy and governance advocates at the regional level.

MISA, the recipient of RCSA's largest single grant, is able to help the local press define realistic positions and to muster regional and international support on press issues; and its influence was strongly felt in the largely successful battles this year against government efforts to control the media in several countries of the region. Although probably only MISA can at this time be considered a regional civil society player with real clout, RCSA grantees WILDAF and AFRONET are also seen as effective regional advocates for women's rights and human rights, respectively. Again, while RCSA partners decry the continuing relative weakness of regional advocacy organizations, most also consider those advocacy efforts critical to their own effective national-level work.

During 1997, SAHRINGON, formed as a direct offshoot of an RCSA-funded meeting of human rights NGOs, coordinated regional agreement on statements commenting on the

Regional Influence Index-1997 Country Results				
Country	# DG Events *	Nil Regl. Infl.	Some Regl. Infl. **	%
Angola	Focus groups were not conducted			
Botswana	14	10	4	28.6
Mozambique	4	13	1	7.1
Lesotho	7	6	1	14.3
Malawi	8	6	2	25.0
Namibia	9	4	5	55.6
South	13	11	2	15.4
Swaziland	10	4	6	60.0
Tanzania	8	5	3	37.5
Zambia	10	7	3	30.0
Zimbabwe	16	5	11	68.8
Regional index (simple average of country scores)				34.2
*# of important DG "events" in subject country during 1997 identified by focus group. ** # of events with respect to which focus group agreed regional influence on national discourse was discernible.				

Government of Zambia's response to the failed coup and other regional events. A SAHRINGON appeal to the August SADC Summit in Malawi to expand SADC's focus on human rights and democracy and governance issues was widely reported in the region. Important training in the effective use of available information was provided by South Africa's RCSA-supported Cooperative for Research and Education, which conducted a well-received series of advocacy training workshops in Botswana, Malawi and elsewhere and is now preparing an "advocacy portfolio" of case studies for dissemination throughout the region.

Because of the extreme difficulty both of defining "norm-setting" activities and of gaining a comprehensive knowledge of all such activities in the region, RCSA plans to track only those norm-setting activities which



are identified as such and funded by RCSA rather than all such activities in the region. Consistent with RCSA's expectation that activity toward achievement of the Objective's **Intermediate Result 3**, "Regional Norms Further Defined by Southern Africans," will emerge from, and, therefore, lag behind, activities under IRs 1 and 2, no grants have yet been made which directly advance this IR. Accordingly, no reporting has been done under this IR. While little or no activity under this IR was expected during 1997, in discussions with such major regional DG entities and RCSA partners as the Southern Africa Political and Economy Series Trust and SARDC, RCSA has been encouraging interest in housing norms-setting activities within their programs.

RCSA has little or no control over achievement of **Intermediate Result 4**, "Continued Support and Strengthening at National Level of Civil Society and Governmental Democracy Advocates." USAID's contribution is made by bilateral missions and not by RCSA. The USAID-convened donor conference discussed below confirms that other donors are also active in achieving this IR. Because its activities (as opposed to those of USAID bilaterals) do not contribute to achieving this IR, *RCSA will, in the future, treat this strategic element as a critical assumption rather than an IR.*

In 1997, RCSA assessed the status of this IR through anecdotal reporting -- whether RCSA is receiving applications for regional work from credible and effective national-level entities and whether RCSA DG recipients report that the national-level entities with which they work are competent, capable and have sufficient capacity to cooperate in regional activities and to make good use of information and advocacy resulting from those activities.

Information to date indicates that the number and distribution of such entities is, overall, sufficient, although by no means excessive. The capacity of civil society organizations (CSOs) to lead or participate actively in regional activities is satisfactory in South Africa, Zimbabwe and, to a lesser extent, Botswana, Namibia and Zambia; elsewhere, overall CSO capacity to participate even passively in regional work is troublingly low. Indirect confirmation that adequate national-level capacity exists to conduct the RCSA Strategy is seen in comments indicating that the information and advocacy produced by SARDF partners is known to and highly valued and actively used by their national-level beneficiaries.

#### **Expected Progress Through FY 2000:**

RCSA considers it reasonable to expect the "regional influence" rating to increase by at least 10 percent per year over the next three years at least, from its current 34 percent to 38 percent for 1998, 41 percent for 1999 and 46 percent for 2000. (See Table 1.1) By the year 2000, RCSA would expect that focus groups would perceive a discernible regional influence on the national discourse surrounding half of the most important national DG events in their countries. (Currently-available information and analytical tools make it difficult to predict the rapidity with which that influence will increase; the 10 percent target for annual increases will be continually reexamined as RCSA's analytical capacity improves.)

As the methodology used in measuring this indicator makes country-specific, year-to-year comparisons unreliable, RCSA does not plan to provide such annual performance reporting on a country-specific basis. The country results table shown is included in this narrative, however, to suggest how strongly language barriers and historical isolation or indifference may affect the degree of regional

influence on such countries as Mozambique and South Africa and, by contrast, the overwhelming impact of South Africa's proximity and historical dominance on such countries as Namibia and Swaziland.

While current data do not permit assignment of specific numerical targets to Intermediate Results 1, 2 and 3, by FY 2000 RCSA would expect to see, under IR1, target groups receiving sufficient amounts of timely, relevant and reliable information to be of real and consistent value to them in their work; informed references to regional events as a regular (if perhaps not yet standard) feature of national debates on democracy and governance events under IR2; and active USAID-supported regional norm-setting work being pursued in a half-dozen DG sectors under IR3. At these levels, the "regional factor" will be an established feature which must be taken into account in DG decision making around the region.

Developing and implementing the new long-term Strategy has highlighted the difficulty of systematically and efficiently achieving substantive IR- and SO-level results through a proposal-driven, small-grants program such as SARDF. RCSA is now sufficiently familiar with the DG entities working effectively at the regional level that it may no longer be necessary to incur the high administrative overhead of a small-grants activity.

RCSA will, therefore, be exploring the possibility of developing broader relationships with a limited number of known and effective regional entities which would, in turn, assume responsibility for organizing and aggregating activities to achieve IR-level results. (RCSA might, for example, enter into an agreement with a think tank to sponsor and organize a series of targeted conferences aimed at stimulating norms-setting exercises under IR 3, or with an entity with strong experience in running regional information-exchange

networks to provide technical advice and administrative assistance in establishing networks and similar mechanisms for various DG common interest groups.)

**Links to U.S. National Interests:** The region-wide democratic trend has accentuated a sense of community among some DG groups, together with a readiness to coordinate their activities, and a new awareness that progress or setbacks in one country can significantly affect the DG situation elsewhere. Democratic practices including transparency, opposing corruption and broad-based participation of citizens are integral to SOs 2 and 3. CSOs, including those of the private sector, are increasingly influencing public policy debate and decision-making. Certainly, sustainable economic growth through market integration and accelerated adoption of improved agricultural and natural resource management approaches -- strategies which have proved very successful in other regions of the world -- will contribute significantly to achieving the ultimate aim of creating a cluster functioning democracies in the region.

**Donor Coordination:** Cooperation among donors operating on a regional basis has been effectively non-existent: donors provide regional DG funding from at least seven locations in six countries in the region, as well as from overseas offices. To address the striking lack of communication among such DG programs, and to explore means of cooperating to maximize the impact and benefit for recipients of limited USAID and other-donor DG funds, in early February RCSA convened a conference in Harare of technical field representatives of governmental and private donors and grantmakers conducting DG programming in Southern Africa from a regional perspective.

Most such donors make regional DG grants only intermittently; the Danish International Development Agency may be the only other

donor doing so systematically and on a large scale. RCSA appears to be unique among DG donors in conducting a program seeking regionwide impacts from a Southern African platform. Save for one donor, which focuses on the SADC Secretariat, all attending donors focus support on civil society in both their regional and their bilateral programs. The potential for cooperating with other donors as a group appears limited, particularly with respect to policy coordination, although USAID leadership has been welcomed and

general readiness to cooperate at the level of implementation is great. In view of the small and unfocused regional programs conducted by most donors, concrete benefits are likeliest to be obtained in one-on-one interaction with the few other major players; in addition, a promising upshot from the Harare meeting was the eagerness of several of the major recipient organizations (many of which participated as resource people) to assume active responsibility for promoting donor coordination on a regional basis.

**Table 1.1: Proportion of National-Level DG Events, Discourse Around Which is Discernibly Influenced by Regional Factors**

<b>STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1:</b> Increased Regional Capacity to Influence Democratic Performance <b>APPROVED:</b> 15/AUG/1997 <b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> USAID/RCSA			
<b>RESULT NAME:</b> Increased Regional Capacity to Influence Democratic Performance			
<b>INDICATOR:</b> Regional Influence on National DG Discourse			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Proportion of national-level DG events, discourse around which is discernibly influenced by regional factors expressed as average percentage of national DG events showing regional influence in all covered countries. <b>SOURCE:</b> Focus groups representative of politically knowledgeable class in each country. <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> SO1 aims at expanding the degree to which information, experience and advocacy from beyond each country's borders is brought to bear during debate over the key DG "events" each year. Indicator is intended to reflect perceptions of opinion-forming segment of population. <b>COMMENTS:</b> Table 1.1 aggregates results over whole region; table provided in narrative provides country results which produced Table 1.1 figures. Inconsistencies in constituting focus groups may have resulted in overstatement of experience in individual cases (e.g., Zimbabwe) and for the region as a whole.	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1997(B)		34.2%
	1998	37.6%	
	1999	41.4%	
	2000	45.5%	
	2003(T)	60.6%	

**Table 1.2: Perception of Beneficiaries of SO1-Funded Information-Dissemination Efforts of Overall Value of Information Received**

<b>STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1:</b> Increased Regional Capacity to Influence Democratic Performance <b>APPROVED:</b> 15/AUG/1997 <b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> USAID/RCSA			
<b>RESULT NAME:</b> Increased Information Sharing Within the Region			
<b>INDICATOR:</b> Perception of Beneficiaries of SO1-Funded Information-Dissemination Efforts of Overall Value of Information Received			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Percentages of recipients finding overall value of information satisfactory or better <b>SOURCE:</b> Random survey of recipients of information. Names to be taken from mailing lists provided by grantees <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> Purpose is to assess value of information disseminated as a result of RCSA DG grants. <b>COMMENTS:</b> Results obtained in 1997 were not reportable due to late commencement of study, consequent difficulties in obtaining mailing lists and problems with the survey instrument which did not adequately distinguish between the perceived value of RCSA-funded information dissemination and other information disseminated by RCSA recipients. RCSA hopes to conduct a revised baseline study in mid-1998 to permit reporting on progress in 1999 R4.  While assessments could not be made of value of RCSA-funded information dissemination, responses to survey did indicate that a majority of those contacted considered the broader category of all information disseminated by RCSA's current grantees to be "critical" to their work.	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1997(B)		TBD
	1998	10% increase	
	1999	10% increase	
	2000	10% increase	
	2003(T)	80% positive customer satisfaction level	

## **Strategic Objective 2: A More Integrated Regional Market**

### **Purpose and Background of the Objective:**

During the formulation of its 1997-2003 Strategy, RCSA embraced a goal held by many Southern Africans: regional market integration. In May 1997, RCSA formally adopted this goal and designated it Strategic Objective 2. SO2 was developed in the belief that Southern Africa's economic performance will improve if the region can begin to operate as a single market in which goods, services, capital, and labor move easily across national borders. RCSA expects a more integrated regional market to lead to increased trade and investment. Increased trade and investment will, in turn, lead to business expansion, employment and income growth and greater food security. While SO2 is a newly formulated RCSA objective, it includes projects that the Regional Center managed for the past two years in indigenous business development and infrastructure policy reform. It also incorporates many recommendations gathered from extensive consultation with RCSA counterparts around the region about the potential benefits of regional integration.

Two indicators have been developed to measure economic integration in Southern Africa. They are:

***Increased Value of Regional Trade*** -- Market integration will result in increased intra-regional trade flows. Thus, the total value of exports from each SADC country to the other 11 will be monitored.

***Convergence of Wholesale Prices*** -- As the regional market becomes more integrated, price differentials among countries due to trade barriers and infrastructure inefficiencies should diminish. The disparity in wholesale prices for selected commodities will be monitored.

**Increased Value of Regional Trade:** As shown in Table 2.1, the total value of intra-SADC exports was \$9.04 billion in 1995. Seventy-four percent of these exports were from South Africa to other SADC countries, emphasizing the dominance of South Africa in the regional market. The other members of the Southern African Customs Union (SACU) together accounted for another 18 percent of the region's total export value. Among non-SACU members of SADC, only Zimbabwe exported more than 1 percent of the total value. Between 1995 and 1996, intra-SADC exports in real terms (adjusted for inflation) decreased by 3.3 percent, while real total exports from the region to the rest of world fell by about 4.8 percent. RCSA expects to see a reversal of this trend as the Southern African market becomes more integrated and member states continue to reduce rates of inflation.

Intra-SADC exports account for only 20 percent of all exports from the region in 1995. Most exports to countries outside of the SADC region are mineral or agricultural commodities, with minimal value added in the first case and almost no value added in the second case. Because these exports to the rest of the world are so important to the region's economy and because the reduced trade barriers and improved infrastructural efficiencies that promote market integration will also increase the regions' global competitiveness, SADC's trade with the rest of the world will also be monitored. Expansion in intra-regional trade is expected to occur as a result of trade creation -- a shift in the geographic source of imports from higher-cost to lower-cost member countries. Trade diversion, a shift in the source of imports from lower-cost, non-member countries to higher-cost member

### Intra-SADC Exports as a Proportion of SADC's Trade with the Rest of the World

Year	Trade with Rest of World (US \$million)	Intra-SADC Exports (US \$million)	Intra-SADC Exports as % of Trade with Rest of World
1995	45,004	9,044	20.1
1996	42,858	8,744	20.4

Source: Statistics Offices, SADC. Tanzania excluded because data on exports to countries outside SADC were not available.

countries, will be monitored to insure that efficiency gains from regional integration outweigh efficiency losses. The net welfare effect will depend on whether trade creation or trade diversion dominates the process of economic integration. Increases in the value of SADC imports from the rest of the world, as well as intra-SADC imports to ensure that the SADC regional economy is not marginalized in the global market, will also be monitored. Between 1995 and 1996, the value of SADC's imports, in real terms, from the rest of the world fell by about 2 percent, while the value of intra-SADC imports fell by roughly 1 percent.

**Convergence of Wholesale Prices:** Four commodities have been selected to serve as a proxy for overall wholesale price convergence

in the SADC region. Panado (an over-the-counter pain relief medication), Surf (a washing powder), Colgate toothpaste, and Toyota oil filters were selected because they are widely available and commonly used in the region. Furthermore, they are mainly produced outside of the region or only in South Africa, a fact that will help ensure that price variations around the region do not arise from variations in local production costs. Anticipated standard deviations, as shown in the table at the end of this section, are based on an assumption that the standard deviation for each commodity price will decrease by 5 percent per year. Price deviations around the region will never completely disappear because of transport and other costs that differ throughout the region.

### Convergence of Wholesale Prices in the SADC Region

Commodity	Baseline (1997)		Standard Deviation (Planned)					
	Mean Price (US\$)	Std.Dev.	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Panado (1 x 120 tablets)	7.07	3.11	2.95	2.80	2.66	2.53	2.40	2.28
Surf (36 x 500 g.)	29.70	8.38	7.96	7.57	7.19	6.83	6.49	6.16
Colgate (12 x 100 g.)	16.48	15.53	14.76	14.02	13.32	12.65	12.02	11.42
Toyota 1300 oil filter	6.46	3.08	2.92	2.78	2.64	2.51	2.38	2.26

Source: wholesale traders. In the future, computation of the mean price will take account of country sample sizes.

**Progress to Date and Expected Progress Through FY 2000:** Although SO2 has not been in place long enough to show attributable results at the SO level, the SO builds on past work and has achieved significant tangible results at the Intermediate Level. Intermediate

Results for SO2 are: *Reduced Barriers to Broadened Participation in the Regional Market (IR1), More Efficient Provision of Infrastructure (IR2), and Advocacy for Sustained Regional Integration Strengthened (IR3).*

---

**SAEDF Strengthens SMEs**

- The Manager of Kingdom Securities Holdings in Zimbabwe states that SAEDF's demanding due diligence and negotiation process helped his company identify weaknesses and take corrective measures which resulted in a better, more sustainable enterprise. This company is positioned to make major contributions to the economy of Zimbabwe, serving as a broker, trader, investment advisor and "market maker" on the Zimbabwe Stock Exchange.
  - The Manager of Rural Housing Finance in South Africa reports that SAEDF funding increased the company's capital base to the point where it could attract additional funds from other sources to expand the housing finance available to low-income wage earners.
  - Ostrich Production Namibia's primary individual shareholder stated that SAEDF's support provided co-investors with a vital measure of confidence that helped to move the project forward. This start-up venture, which includes an indigenous association of communal ostrich farmers as a majority shareholder, is expected to create 440 direct jobs and an additional 1,000 employment opportunities for communal farmers (68% of whom are women).
- 

**IR1 - Reduced Barriers to Broadened Participation in the Regional Market:** High import duties, trade quotas, complex customs procedures, corruption, strict agricultural import rules, over-regulation of investors, high taxation, a lack of access to credit, and complex company licensing requirements all increase the cost of doing business in Southern Africa. Eliminating these trade and investment barriers will help integrate the regional market by expanding opportunity and allowing more people to participate in the regional economy.

IR1 represents a new area of endeavor for RCSA, with the exception of the SAEDF, which provides equity capital and loans to historically disadvantaged small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in Southern Africa. Consequently, this report on IR1 discusses SAEDF and highlights RCSA's plans for helping to reduce trade and investment barriers in the region.

The *SAEDF* board has authorized projects with 16 clients in seven countries (Angola, Botswana, Namibia, South Africa, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe) for investments totaling approximately \$13.6 million. An interim assessment of SAEDF conducted by Coopers & Lybrand during the final quarter of 1997 revealed that SAEDF investments have helped to create one new enterprise, strengthen four others and provide more housing to low-income South Africans and create one hundred twenty two new jobs.

Ratification of the *Trade Protocol* by SADC member states has been slow, with only Botswana, Mauritius and Tanzania having ratified it since its signing in August 1996. This process is hindered by a dearth of capacity in the region to fully negotiate complex treaties and trade agreements. Several studies have noted the institutional weakness of the SADC bodies responsible for insuring the implementation of the SADC Protocol on Trade, and RCSA is working to address some of these weaknesses. In March 1998, RCSA will place two short-term advisors at the SADC Industry and Trade Coordination Division (SITCD) in Tanzania to help develop a strategy and action plan for implementing the protocol. In June 1998, RCSA will meet with SITCD staff to review the action plan and identify specific areas for further RCSA support over the next two years.

An RCSA-funded trade workshop in May 1997 with private sector participation contributed significantly toward developing a consensus on the major constraints to increasing trade throughout the Southern African region and establishing a list of priority interventions necessary to implement the SADC Trade Protocol. Workshop participants identified, as a priority, the need to harmonize and simplify customs and trade documentation and procedures. Responding to this need, RCSA will be working with governmental and non-governmental regional



organizations to simplify and harmonize customs and trade documentation in the region. This effort is expected to take three years. RCSA has also had preliminary discussions with the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) regarding possible areas of assistance to that organization. Several of the proposals currently under consideration relate directly or indirectly to the implementation of the SADC Trade Protocol, since the two organizations share the objective of promoting regional integration through trade and investment. RCSA also plans to facilitate the efforts of a cluster of trade associations in Botswana, Mozambique, Namibia, Zambia and Zimbabwe to influence their respective governments in reducing trade barriers.

Two performance indicators will be used to monitor progress in the reduction of trade barriers: ***Reduced Clearance Times at Representative Border Posts*** and ***Reduced Share of Intra-SADC Imports Subject to Tariffs in Excess of 10 Percent***.

The SADC Border Post Operations Working Group, which receives USAID funding, is currently collecting data on clearance times at selected border posts in the region. This information will be used as baseline data for the first indicator when it becomes available. Data for the second indicator are presented in Table 2.2. As shown in the data table, 39.5 percent of intra-SADC imports were subject to tariffs in excess of 10 percent in 1995. Mozambique, Zambia and Malawi subject the lowest shares of intra-SADC imports to high tariffs. SACU, Mauritius and Zimbabwe levy high tariffs on a relatively larger part of intra-SADC imports.

SADC is currently negotiating a tariff reduction schedule which distinguishes among three categories of products: 1) those for which the tariff can be immediately reduced to zero; 2) "sensitive" products for which tariffs

will be phased out over a six-year period after ratification; and 3) all other products for which tariffs will gradually be reduced over the eight-year period following ratification. Since the Protocol is not likely to be ratified until the end of 1998 at the earliest, significant reductions in tariffs may not occur until 2000 or beyond.

**IR2 - More Efficient Provision of Infrastructure:** RCSA has incorporated its ongoing infrastructure policy reform activities into SO2 largely under the second intermediate result. The activities under this IR seek to harmonize the region's infrastructure laws, regulatory frameworks, and technical standards, provide technical assistance to help privatize or commercialize telephone and railway companies, strengthen the governmental bodies that oversee the transport and telecommunications sectors and encourage more private sector involvement in the provision of infrastructure services. Until recently in this region, the notion of privatizing national infrastructure assets was far from universally accepted. Many governments did not understand the value of separating infrastructure provision from infrastructure regulation, and many countries did not even pay lip service to standardizing their infrastructure practices or to privatizing their infrastructure service providers. Through a highly participatory process that has included technical assistance, training, workshops, and dialogue to develop regional standards and agreements, RCSA has been instrumental in promoting an enormous attitude change among Southern African government and business leaders (see box on Model Legislation). Because of this assistance, key regional players have been made aware of telecommunication policy changes that are taking place the world over resulting in cheaper and better service to the consumer and become convinced of the need to implement these changes. As a result, regional discussions now center on the mechanics of

privatization and regulation, not on the pros and cons of the concepts. For instance, at a recent workshop on telecommunications reform legislation, in a significant departure from only a few years ago, not one delegate questioned whether an independent regulator was necessary or whether competition was in their country's national interest.

In addition to helping shape attitudes in the region and promoting the Transport, Communications and Meteorology Protocol, RCSA's telecommunications project is also assisting the Zambia Privatization Agency as it privatizes Zambia's national telephone company, ZamTel. The privatization of ZamTel will be one of the first national telephone company privatizations in Africa. In 1997, USAID regional funds helped SADC advance the goal of harmonizing the laws that govern their transport and telecommunications sectors among member states. The regionally-funded Malawi Railways Restructuring Program is making steady progress in helping to ensure the privatization of Malawi Railways. Working with the World Bank, the project has helped the Malawian government to pre-qualify seven potential concessionaires. Consultants are completing the offering prospectus, and technical proposals are to be submitted in May 1998. Malawi's Privatization Commission expects the concessionaire to be in operation of the railway by the end of calendar year 1998.

Two indicators will be used to monitor progress in the efficiency of provision of infrastructure services. They are: ***Reduced Transport Costs of Imports and Increased Number of Licensed Telecommunications Service Providers***.

For the first indicator, Table 2.3 shows the cost of moving a 12-meter container from the South African Port of Durban or the Mozambican Port of Beira to a destination in Ndola, Zambia. This is a typical movement

with an importer having the choice of using either road or rail transport. The assumption is that the importer will use the lowest cost option. This model assumes that the effect of other factors such as reliability, security of goods, delays, etc., are held constant. General efficiency is expected to increase and costs to decrease as infrastructure is upgraded, standards and operating practices are harmonized regionally, and the private sector becomes increasingly involved in the provision of transport services.

For the second indicator, RCSA is assuming that when the number of telecommunications providers rises, competition also increases, with the corresponding benefits to consumers including lower prices and higher quality service. Effective telecommunications regulatory bodies are important to the region because they help insure fair competition among telecommunications providers. Monitoring licensed providers gives RCSA insight into how well the region's licensing authorities are functioning.

Table 2.4 shows a steady increase in the number of licensed telephone companies in the region. Starting in 1993, there were state-owned telephone companies in each of the 12 countries that now make up the SADC region, plus one cellular company each in South Africa and Mauritius. In the years since 1993, the presence of cellular providers in the region has steadily increased. In the SADC region 10 of the 12 countries now have at least a cellular telephone company and Botswana and Swaziland expect to inaugurate service within the year. At present, no country in the SADC region has more than one fixed line provider, though this may change in coming years as privatizations and competition continue to gain currency. The data do not include Internet Service Providers (ISPs). All countries in the region have at least one ISP. Together, the 11 countries minus South Africa have about 60. South Africa alone has nearly 100. It is

expected that the number of ISPs will decline in several countries as competitive forces eliminate inefficient providers.

Finally RCSA and the Global Bureau will be jointly carrying out an assessment of how the

private sectors. This will help create an environment that supports the efficient conduct of business. A related objective is to strengthen private sector networks so that they become strong partners in shaping national and regional policies.

---

#### **Dialogue Leading to Regional Improvements**

Before USAID began providing assistance to the SADC countries to address their transport constraints, discussion was concentrated among governments and state-owned enterprises to the exclusion of the private sector, even though the private sector was directly affected by government policies. The situation has now changed completely. For example, RCSA helped establish the Border Post Operations Working Group in September 1996. This region-wide body brings together key stakeholders from the public and private sectors to identify collective solutions leading to improved operations. This includes customs facilitation at SADC international borders so as to reduce delays experienced by freight trucks, public passenger vehicles and private cars. The Group expects to present a draft Memorandum of Understanding to SADC governments during 1998 that will commit them to adopt streamlined and simplified cross-border facilitation measures.

---

sharing of electricity can be made more effective throughout the region. The work currently being carried out by Purdue University suggests that there are potential savings of \$50-\$60 million per year if a power sharing scheme is correctly implemented. Based on the results of this assessment, RCSA will determine how it will focus its resources and adjust its indicators in this area as necessary.

**IR3 - Advocacy for Sustained Regional Integration Strengthened:** An important aspect of creating a more integrated regional market is the promotion of strong networks and private sector-led regional bodies. In the coming year, RCSA expects to become active in supporting networks among groups that promote regional economic integration. These activities will be aimed at influencing policy formulation and implementation through an effective dialogue between the public and

During this reporting period, RCSA brought to closure the MOU that had been signed between Vice President Gore and SADC Executive Secretary Mbuende. Much of the work under the MOU was facilitated by SO2 over the last year and included the following: 1) Providing the SADC Executive Secretariat with e-mail connectivity to its trade unit in Dar Es Salaam and its Finance and Investment Unit in South Africa. This facilitated the exchange of information among the entities. The training that was provided has also made them aware of the databases (such as Tradenet) available in the internet, resulting in their active use. 2) Along with the Department of Commerce, sponsoring a Trade Forum in Washington. This forum brought together Trade Ministers from the SADC countries, key private sector Southern Africans, USG trade specialists and U.S. businesses to discuss implementation issues of the SADC Trade Protocol as well as lessons that the U.S. has learned as it has implemented the NAFTA treaty.

In the infrastructure sector, regionally-funded projects are helping to strengthen working groups that seek to promote regional integration in rail, roads, and telecommunications. To help implement the Transport, Communications and Meteorology Protocol, USAID has helped the Southern African Transport and Communications Commission (SATCC) establish specialized committees, such as the Road Network Management and Financing Task Force, the Border Post Operations Working Group, and the Road User Charges Task Force. In a significant departure from past SADC practice, these working groups have strong private-

sector participation. Organizations such as the Federation of Clearing and Forwarding Associations of Southern Africa, the Federation of Regional Road Freight Association, the Southern Africa Railways Association, the Southern Africa Telecommunications Association, and the Telecommunications Regulators Association of Southern Africa now have full representation on these committees.

To measure the IR's success, the number of formal agreements that are signed by SADC countries will be monitored to determine whether there was private sector participation in the process. It is expected that, over time, private sector participation will increase. Baseline data are still being collected for this indicator.

**Links to U.S. National Interests:** As the region's markets open up to the flow of goods, services and capital, there are advantages for U.S. business interests and a "win-win" potential for Southern Africa's place in the global economy. Southern Africa's 140 million people presents a significant market for U.S. goods and services, as well as a valuable source of mineral resources for the United States. U.S. exports to the region continued to grow in 1997, flowing largely to South Africa.

With the World Bank forecasting continuing regional growth, Southern Africa will be the second-fastest growing region in the world during the next five years. U.S. business interest in the region is demonstrated by companies such as SBC, General Motors Corporation and Motorola are investing heavily in the region, as well.

**Donor Coordination:** Other donors undertaking activities that promote market integration in Southern Africa include the European Union (EU), the World Bank, the Nordic countries, the Canadian International Development Agency, and the United

Kingdom's Department for International Development. The EU is assisting SATCC to undertake a comprehensive trade/infrastructure analysis through the Transport and Communications Integration Study for Southern Africa. The World Bank is involved in a road maintenance initiative and has just announced a major regional program, two key components of which are the promotion of trade and investment and the rehabilitation of the region's transportation infrastructure. Project managers for the RCSA's transport and telecommunications projects hold periodic meetings with the EU to ensure that infrastructure programs are not duplicative and RCSA intends to work closely with the World Bank in its new initiative. RCSA also works closely with USAID bilateral missions that are implementing projects in transport and telecommunications with regional funds, notably USAID/Mozambique and USAID/Malawi.

**Synergies:** The Intermediate Results encompassed by SO2 are mutually supportive and re-enforcing. When telecommunications and transport costs are reduced and when border crossings are eased, more players will participate in the regional market. As investment and trade barriers are reduced or eliminated, increased private sector participation will accelerate the pace of infrastructure improvement, resulting in new entrants into the transport and telecommunications business. Addressing these issues at a regional level is a complex undertaking that requires continuous advocacy by and dialogue between the public and private sectors. As advocacy groups and networks are strengthened to better address these issues, more Southern Africans will be able to participate in the decision-making process. This will further accelerate the elimination of barriers to even greater participation.

---

**Model Legislation for Infrastructure Reform**

Southern African transport and telecommunications networks fail to reach their maximum efficiency in part because of a lack of standardization across the region. The SADC countries have disparate axle load limits, weigh bridge operations, vehicle insurance requirements, truck driver accreditation schemes, road signs, railroad signaling, radio spectrum management plans, cellular telephone standards, and international telephone tariffs. The confusion and delays arising from these variations lead to expenses that are passed directly to consumers. Similarly, potential regional and international investors are frustrated by a bewildering array of laws and regulations affecting privatization, taxation, foreign ownership of assets, and the transfer of capital.

Through technical assistance and a series of workshops, USAID and SADC have drafted model laws designed to reform the region's transport and telecommunications sectors and bring individual countries into conformity with the Transport and Communications Protocol. In recent months, SADC and USAID have been seeking comments on these draft laws from business associations, potential investors, and infrastructure users, and have been building regional consensus for their provisions among governments. RCSA expects the committee of SADC transport and telecommunications ministers to endorse the draft laws in June 1998. The bills will then become integral parts of the Protocol, and, upon Protocol ratification, the SADC member states will be legally bound to enact them. Meanwhile, Lesotho, Mauritius and Swaziland are already working to enact the model telecommunications law.

While SATCC recognizes that each Southern African country will need to adapt the model laws to its own national circumstances, the draft bills specify minimum standards and set specific guidance for the policy and regulatory issues that affect the region's infrastructure. The bills stress independent regulation and encourage private participation in the provision of infrastructure services. RCSA strongly believes that enacting uniform transport and telecommunications laws across the SADC countries will go a long way toward promoting trade and investment and achieving the type of market integration that both USAID and SADC seek for the region.

---

**Table 2.1: Value of Intra-SADC Trade**

<b>STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2:</b> A More Integrated Regional Market <b>APPROVED:</b> 15/AUG/1997 <b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> USAID/RCSA			
<b>RESULT NAME:</b> A More Integrated Regional Market			
<b>INDICATOR:</b> Increased Value of Intra-SADC Trade			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> U.S. \$million	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
<b>SOURCE:</b> Statistics offices, customs and revenue authorities, SADC sector reports	1995(B)		9,044
<b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> Total exports (from each of the SADC countries to the other eleven). 1995 is the base year. Figures for 1996 are adjusted for inflation. Projections are based on a real increase of 2% per year through 1999 and 5% thereafter. Projection will be refined as more data becomes available.	1996		8,744
	1997	8,919	
	1998	9,097	
	1999	9,279	
	2000	9,465	
<b>COMMENTS:</b> Since one SADC member's intra-regional exports are another member's intra-regional imports, it is sufficient to track total intra-SADC exports. Data from Tanzania was not available. Actual regional data for 1997 are not yet available.	2003(T)	10,957	

**Table 2.2: Proportion of Intra-SADC Imports Subject to Tariffs in Excess of 10%**

<b>STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2:</b> A More Integrated Regional Market <b>APPROVED:</b> 15/AUG/1997 <b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> USAID/RCSA			
<b>RESULT NAME:</b> Reduced Barriers to Broadened Participation in the Regional Market			
<b>INDICATOR:</b> Decreased Proportion of Intra-SADC Imports Subject to Tariffs in Excess of 10%			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Percentage of total value of intra-SADC imports subject to tariffs in excess of 10% <b>SOURCE:</b> Baseline data derived from SADC briefing paper entitled, "'Hard-Core' Tariffs on Intra-SADC Trade, and Their Elimination in the Context of the Implementation of the SADC Trade Protocol" (December 1997). RCSA will engage consultants to collect comparable data for 1996 and beyond. <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> Percentage of total intra-SADC imports subject to tariffs in excess of 10%, derived by weighting total value of intra-SADC imports into each country by the percentage of such imports subject to tariffs in excess of 10%. <b>COMMENTS:</b> 1995 data for Angola not available, nor 1995 data on import shares by tariff range for Tanzania. Planned values for 1996-99 based on fact that only 3 countries have ratified SADC protocol to date and only Zimbabwe (among SADC members of COMESA) has published COMESA tariffs for 1996. Planned values starting from 2000 based on assumption that protocol ratified and tariff schedule negotiated by end of 1998, and that tariff reductions are phased in over 6-8 years after ratification.	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1995(B)		39.5
	1996	38.8	
	1997	36.8	
	1998	36.1	
	1999	35.4	
	2000	32.8	
	2003(T)	23.9	

**Table 2.3: Transport Costs of Imports**

<b>STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2:</b> A More Integrated Regional Market <b>APPROVED:</b> 15/AUG/1997 <b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> USAID/RCSA				
<b>RESULT NAME:</b> More Efficient Provision of Infrastructure				
<b>INDICATOR:</b> Reduced Transport Costs of Imports				
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> U.S. \$ at current prices <b>SOURCE:</b> Quotations from railway and major road transporters <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> Minimum cost (in US \$ by either road or rail) of transportation for an inbound full twelve-meter container. The least of the quotes is taken as the cost of transportation. <b>COMMENTS:</b> The planned figures indicate a reduction in transportation costs at the rate of 5% per year up to 1999 and then at 10% up to the year 2001 when costs are expected to stabilize with marginal reductions of 2% per year.	<b>YEAR</b>		<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1997(B)	Durban to Ndola		3,100
		Beira to Ndola		2,676
	1998	Durban to Ndola	2,945	
		Beira to Ndola	2,542	
	1999	Durban to Ndola	2,798	
		Beira to Ndola	2,415	
	2000	Durban to Ndola	2,518	
		Beira to Ndola	2,174	
	2003(T)	Durban to Ndola	2,177	
		Beira to Ndola	1,880	



**Table 2.4: Licensed Telecommunications Service Providers**

<b>STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2:</b> A More Integrated Regional Market			
<b>APPROVED:</b> 15/AUG/1997 <b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> USAID/RCSA			
<b>RESULT NAME:</b> More Efficient Provision of Infrastructure			
<b>INDICATOR:</b> Number of Licensed Telecommunications Service Providers			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> # of service providers <b>SOURCE:</b> Survey of telecommunication regulatory authorities and ministries <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> Basic and cellular telephone services providers that have obtained licenses from SADC governments. Projections are based on a 10% yearly growth in the number of service providers. <b>COMMENTS:</b> The number of telephone and cellular companies in the region serves as a proxy for the number of people who have access to telecommunications services. Telephone and cellular companies are reluctant to release precise counts of their customers, so monitoring the number of providers gives the team insight into the number of users. The planned figures show an increase of 10% per year.	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1993(B)		14
	1996	25	27
	1997	27	28
	1998	31	
	1999	34	
	2000	38	
	2003(T)	45	

### **Strategic Objective 3: Accelerated Regional Adoption of Sustainable Agriculture and Natural Resource Management Approaches**

#### **Purpose and Background of the Objective:**

This strategic objective builds on a strong foundation of activities financed under ISA predecessor activities. RCSA's experience under SO3 illustrates the value of working from a regional platform to pilot-test agricultural technologies and natural resource management approaches which have wide applicability in the region and utilize regional networks to disseminate the results of these pilot-tests across multiple borders. This approach has enabled a more rapid transfer and adoption of technology by Southern Africa's small farmers than would have been possible working solely on a bilateral basis. Demand is generated for newly tested approaches as information flows and the exchange of regional experiences is enhanced.

#### **Performance and Progress To Date:**

Performance, at the SO level, will be determined by the transfer of lessons learned and the generation of regional demand for new technologies and approaches. Experience among the agricultural networks and natural resource management activities has shown that lessons are being transferred, adapted, and acted upon; and that demand for these technologies is manifested among beneficiaries, donors and governments.

Sustainable and profitable technologies and approaches developed under the Sorghum/Millet Improvement Program (SMIP), Southern Africa Root Crops Research Network (SARRNET) and Natural Resources Management Project (NRMP) programs continue to be adopted by smallholders throughout Southern Africa (Table 2.1). Numerous varieties of sorghum, millet, cassava and sweet potato with higher yields, good performance in drought years, and

disease and pest resistance have been developed, tested, and disseminated by the international agricultural research centers over the past decade in collaboration with partners in the national agricultural research systems. Particularly noteworthy are the advances in root crop production and increased hectares planted in Malawi. Stunning increases have resulted in area/yield of 68 percent and 148 percent for cassava, and 145 percent and 184 percent for sweet potato, respectively, between

---

#### **El Niño and USAID-Supported Crops**

The 1997 El Niño Southern Oscillation Event was expected to produce below average rainfall in much of Southern Africa. Although rainfall has been better than anticipated, farmers responded to the early warnings of possible drought both by planting less area and by switching from maize to drought-resistant varieties of crops whose development USAID has long supported (cassava and sweet potato through SARRNET, and sorghum and millet through SMIP). Thus, although current year production will be lower than average in many countries, the data show that farmers' positive response to the early warning provided by SADC with assistance from the USAID/AFR/SD Famine Early Warning System (FEWS) led them to take actions which will result in increased household and national food security.

---

1986 and 1997. While the total area planted with improved millet seed exceeded RCSA's 1996-97 target of 20 percent (21.5 percent), the area planted with improved sorghum seed fell short of the 20 percent target (achieving 16.5 percent), as adoption rates appear to be leveling off. Further analysis indicates a need to develop and make available a more complete technical package of planting materials. Program levels permitting, the new Strategy will address these issues.

RCSA is at the forefront of regional development and testing of community-based approaches to improved natural resources management through the NRMP. These approaches are now being extended to new countries and new areas within countries by governments and NGO partners, often with the assistance of new donor funding. Equally important, however, these approaches are being adapted within existing areas to new applications -- in managing forests in Botswana, for example. The results are a greatly increased area under CBNRM management in Southern Africa, with accompanying increases in rural incomes from new natural resource-based enterprises. For example, the number of participating communities in Botswana increased from zero in 1989 to more than 30 in 1997, while the districts participating under Zimbabwe's CAMPFIRE program increased from three in 1986 to 37 districts over the same period. USAID/Namibia reports similar results for NRMP/Living in a Finite Environment (LIFE) activity. The challenge facing RCSA is to assure that best practices are supported by an appropriate policy framework region-wide and mechanisms are developed to effectively transfer valuable lessons from these field experiences beyond the pilot countries to at least the rest of the SADC region.

**IR1 - Functioning systems in place for transferring Ag/NRM technologies and best practices across the region:** Substantial progress was realized in 1997 toward achieving the first intermediate result under SO3, both in terms of improved regional institutional capacity (IR1.2) and the successful development and testing of Ag/NRM technologies and approaches (IR1.3).

The strength and number of networks for information exchange among practitioners and analysts continue to advance, largely through the efforts of two leading partners, Southern African Center for Cooperation in Agriculture

and Natural Resources Research and Training (SACCAR) in the agricultural sector, and International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) (through Networking and Capacity Building initiative (NETCAB) and NRMP) in the natural resources sector, both of whom bring large networks of collaborators together in the SADC countries. These two organizations are exhibiting leadership and capacity in strategy development, program planning, and information management. IUCN markedly improved its handling of applications for grant funding under NETCAB's small grants fund. SACCAR completed a highly participatory process to develop the region's new agricultural research and training strategy. The NRMP network was described in a recent report as the region's strongest NRM technology-disseminating network citing its publications, radio broadcasts, conferences and electronic connectivity; its newsletter, *Resource Africa* reaches over 2,000 recipients.

Twenty IUCN member organizations in Southern Africa, including NRMP partners, are connected via e-mail, bringing connectivity to nearly all members. Similar success has been achieved with members and collaborators of SACCAR, five of whose twelve crop networks (representing sixty institutions) received e-mail service and training, largely as a result of collaborative support from AFRICALINK, an activity managed by AFR/SD/PSGE. Rapid dissemination of information on new technologies and approaches is essential to achieving the results of SO3. Although it is still early to determine the actual level or effectiveness of use, three of the five SACCAR networks with e-mail now fund connectivity entirely on their own.

As the NRMP matures, increasing evidence accumulates on the viability of CBNRM and natural resource-based community enterprises. Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe report steady increases in gross income and in the number of participants in their CBNRM

programs, as well as evidence that resource use is sustainable. Total revenues for NRMP regionally have increased from around \$60,000 in 1989 to nearly \$4 million in 1997.

RCSA seeks to move beyond local successes to explore regional applications. The biennial NRMP conference, held in August 1997 at Victoria Falls, brought together 250 participants representing local leaders, practitioners, parliamentarians and other stakeholders to discuss the important issues of how to reconcile CBNRM with traditional authority structures while maintaining high degrees of local accountability and equity in the distribution of benefits.

The agricultural research programs continue to develop and share promising varieties of important food crops among the regional partners, the international research centers and national agricultural research systems. Increased attention is given to farmer adoption of proven varieties. SMIP's collaborative arrangements contributed to the release of new sorghum varieties in seven of eleven participating countries (involving a total of twenty-three varieties), and to the release of pearl millet varieties in five of nine participating countries (a total of twelve). The biggest advantage of these varieties is early maturity (cutting as much as a month off the normal growing cycle), which enables a good harvest when the rains start late or end early, as well as being higher yielding, increasing farmers' yields by 10-30 percent with no change in crop management, and even 85 percent with improved management. Essential elements of the success in transfer have been the annual collaborative work plans developed by the regional SMIP network, the use of on-farm trials in ten countries, the recent introduction of farmer participatory breeding in three countries, and collaborative arrangements with private seed companies and farmer seed cooperatives.

Under SARRNET, work has progressed steadily on the collection of local varieties, introduction of elite seed and tissue culture material from the international agricultural research institutes, and regional breeding programs for cassava and sweet potato varieties. Particularly noteworthy are the advances in root crop production and area planted in Malawi. The total area of millet planted to improved varieties grew from 70,000 hectares in 1994 to 198,000 in 1997, the area of sorghum planted to new varieties went from 230,000 hectares in 1994 to 330,000 in 1997. When the program started in 1984, there were no improved seed varieties in Southern Africa. The dramatic increase in yields and areas planted in Malawi are cited above, in a country where these are the second and third most important staples after maize; increases are also recorded in Tanzania, Swaziland and Mozambique. Although these crops are noted for the large role they play in food security in Southern Africa, particularly during drought, their commercial importance is growing. It is important to note that these successes might not have been possible under a bilateral program. The process of seed reproduction and dissemination from one country in the region would have been impossible with standard bilateral agreements.

The transfer of approaches regionally depends on established networks and mechanisms for exchanging information. It also depends upon improved data and analysis programs, which emphasize the strengthening of analytic capacity within the region, leading to improved government decisions. Through SACCAR's efforts, regional and national agricultural research institutions have capacity to carry out impact assessments on their research programs, as demonstrated by the number of such assessments successfully carried out. In the process, valuable data are being collected, and the assessments are demonstrating the positive returns achieved from investments in agricultural research. An

impact assessment carried out by SMIP found an internal rate of return of 27 percent for investment into two varieties of sorghum and millet in Zimbabwe, with net benefit streams ranging from \$7.8 million to \$28.9 million depending on future adoption rates. Such information documents the value of research for decision makers.

**IR2 - An enabling environment which promotes increased incentives for smallholders and communities to adopt sustainable Ag/NRM technologies/approaches:** This enabling environment is established through *strengthened local capacity for Ag/NRM decision-making* (IR2.1), *policies which promote sustainable use of Ag/NRM* (IR2.2) and *strengthened regional market structures* (IR2.3). Implementation of new and more favorable natural resource management policies in Namibia, Malawi, Zambia and Botswana is progressing well with NRMP support. Botswana developed a new policy document on CBNRM for authorized management of natural resources by local communities and is in the final phase of legal approval. The "utilization of veldt products [non-traditional forest products] policy" along the lines of existing Botswana wildlife management policy is being developed. A bill before Zambia's Parliament will not only establish a parastatal Wildlife Authority, but will also legitimize community management of wildlife. A new "people and national parks" policy should move forward in 1998 in Namibia which follows the Conservancy Law passed last year. It devolves rights to manage natural resources to rural community "conservancies."

These local achievements have regional impact because national programs share experiences on a regional basis, thus allowing regional learning to take place. For example, Botswana has learned from Zambian and Zimbabwean experiences in policy formulation. Namibia has built upon what it

learned from Botswana. This has now come full circle as Zambia and Zimbabwe are adapting experiences gained from Botswana and Namibia on administrative structures.

Regional analytic capacity moves forward, establishing an enabling environment to promote incentives to adopt approaches. Established under NETCAB, the "Regional Environmental Economics Coordinating Committee," produces and discusses policy briefs and case studies. Due to the success of the pilot activity in Namibia, the regional governments requested that RCSA fund a follow-on regional Natural Resource Accounting project, implemented by regional multi-institutional working groups in three countries. Capacity development for preparing and utilizing natural resource accounts for analysis on policies of regional import, such as the economic pricing of water and wildlife, is a major result expected from this activity.

Regional studies on informal cross-border trade and agricultural comparative advantage, led by the NGO Technoserve and the University of Swaziland (and supported by RCSA, AFR/SD and REDSO/ESA resources), have produced data showing considerable informal cross-border trade. This information is being utilized by policy-makers in several countries to understand how unrecorded cross-border trade in Southern Africa, particularly in agricultural commodities contributes to regional food security and price stability. Clearly shown is the importance of looking at such trade issues from a regional view and understanding how free trade will further enhance the regional market. This study will shape future activities of both SO2 and SO3 as well as AFR/SD.

The comparative advantage studies have found that current production patterns in the region do not reflect an efficient use of domestic resources, particularly when the changes expected to result from new international trade

agreements are taken into account. Perhaps most strikingly, South Africa -- currently the region's largest surplus maize producer, supplying much of its smaller neighbors requirements -- was found not to have a comparative advantage in maize production. The northern tier countries of Zambia, northern Mozambique and Malawi were found to have such a comparative advantage, in part because of higher average rainfall. This comparative advantage is constrained by transportation limits and trade barriers. The results of this study have enormous policy relevance in a number of areas of RCSA involvement, and will be further pursued in future years.

**Expected Progress Through FY 2000:** Regional development requires different methods from those used for country-specific development. Policy dialogue must

---

#### **Heartwater Disease Research Project**

The Heartwater Disease Research Project, undertaken through a grant to the University of Florida, is entering its final phase. This activity supports a new technology application which has important ramifications to farmers in the African region as well as in the U.S. (since the disease is now prevalent in livestock on the Caribbean island of Antigua and can easily spread to the United States). The year 1997 saw expansion of the project, with the establishment of a nine-country steering committee and the launching of field trials in four countries. Two private sector companies are negotiating for a license to market the vaccine, and two other companies for the tick decoy (control technique). Although RCSA support to the effort will end in 1999, this project demonstrates how RCSA can forge important linkages between key regional and international partners to address a common challenge as well as show that investments in foreign agriculture may have direct benefit to American agriculture.

---

concentrate on advantages to inter-regional coordination and benefits that accrue to countries that approach regional solutions to food security, marketing, and transfer of technologies. The SO Team and its partners

are now defining the activities that will lead to results in the new Strategy. The purpose of these activities is to develop, test and regionally disseminate new technology packages for agriculture and Natural Resource Management (Ag/NRM) using as building blocks the experience and technologies developed and tested under the Southern Africa Regional Program and continuing under RCSA funding. New activities will include strengthening of intermediate groups to work as transfer agents; creating a policy environment to support adoption of new technologies and creating a policy environment that empowers communities to make decisions on management of their resources and that frees markets for inputs, production and products. Further development of information and network systems so that both technologies and experiences can be more effectively utilized will continue. The next year will see a major design effort with at least three new activities using this experience and technology base.

During FY 1998 and FY 1999, the SO3 Team will design a set of activities that will provide the results for achieving the Strategic Objective by 2003. Staff to fill one new position and three existing vacancies are being recruited. At the same time, the team will ensure that ongoing activities receive the management needed to bring them to a successful conclusion. RCSA will work closely with AFR/SD, REDSO/ESA, bilateral missions and embassies (in non-presence countries) in the region in developing and implementing the new activities under SO3. A promising start to closer collaboration within USAID on Southern Africa regional Ag/NRM programs was realized with the holding of the first joint coordination meeting in Kampala in February 1998, where combined action plans were developed for complementary IRs and SOs in our respective frameworks. RCSA plans to hold such meetings semi-annually. Also, RCSA is working with AFR/SD on the

development of a comprehensive environmental strategic framework for Southern Africa, called "FRAME," which is intended to help guide future environmental monitoring, programming and budgeting in the region.

SO3's efforts will emphasize the development of an appropriate enabling environment for Ag/NRM in the region, which is a prerequisite to adoption of improved Ag/NRM approaches as well as to sustainability of our investments. SO3 will approach policy development holistically. In doing so, it will produce a policy framework that encourages SADC member countries to provide evenhanded enabling conditions for private sector agents to decide how their resources will be managed for production and sustainability. Our definition of the private sector includes small farmers and farmer/community self-help groups. The enabling conditions include appropriate trade policies, information on internal and international markets, development service/support organizations, environmental protection, and empowerment of rural people to manage local resources. In these efforts the SO3 team will work closely on activities to improve market information and trade policies, using RCSA's Regional Activity to Promote Integration through Dialogue and Policy Implementation (RAPID) project. To develop the Ag/NRM policy framework, RCSA expects to work through a task force of regional decision makers under the SADC mandate. A draft of the policy framework should be developed by FY 2001, as shown in Table 3.2. As they are identified in the framework, high-priority policy reform needs will be tackled, including regional harmonization of standards, and barriers to cross-border movement of agricultural commodities and inputs.

Also by the year 2000, it is expected that progress will be made in the dissemination of technology packages based on the results of

prior RCSA-supported Ag/NRM projects, by working through public and private organizations throughout the region. A challenge for RCSA will be to draw into established partnerships new players, particularly from the private sector and NGO communities and to build new partnerships with groups experienced in technology dissemination. A concern for the program is the weakness of regional institutional capacity in the Ag/NRM sector, including in the designated SADC units, but also in the NGO community. This limited capacity will be addressed in part by assistance under RCSA's STRENGTH program. The future is uncertain for one of USAID's current principal partners, SACCAR, in view of SADC's decision in 1997 to downgrade SACCAR from a commission to a sector coordinating unit. This decision means that SACCAR's future operations must be staffed and financed by the Government of Botswana rather than by all SADC member states. RCSA, in collaboration with AFR/SD, is working closely with SACCAR and the Government of Botswana to ensure a smooth transition. In response to widespread concern that managing SACCAR as a sector coordinating unit could jeopardize SACCAR's links to the international research network and its ability to deliver its core services, the Government of Botswana has solicited USAID assistance to explore innovative approaches to restructuring SACCAR. RCSA and the Government of Botswana see this as an opportunity to design and try out more promising alternatives to the way SADC sector coordinating units have been organized and managed in the past.

**Links to U.S. National Interests:** RCSA has facilitated support for humanitarian response preparedness by hosting training offered by the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance. RCSA addresses disaster relief prevention through results packages in SO3. These packages ensure that communities are better prepared to feed themselves through adoption of improved

agricultural technologies, enabling them to overcome natural cycles toward drought to which Southern Africa is prone. Supportive policy environments are key to these results packages, so that grassroots groups and the private sector are focused in the right directions.

**Donor Coordination:** Other bilateral and multilateral donors are key partners in achieving SO3 results. Implementation of NRMP at the national level involves numerous donors. In Botswana, for example, donor assistance to the Department of Wildlife and National Parks has taken place through an

ongoing dialogue between the Government of Botswana, EU, British, Scandinavian, Dutch, UN and World Bank agencies. Support to SARRNET has taken place through a long-standing partnership with the Germany Aid Agency. SACCAR maintains a very active dialogue with its major donors including bilateral donors, USAID and members of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR). Joint funding has taken place, either through leveraging of funds from other donors who fund different parts of a program, follow-on activities, or share in the funding of the same activity.



**Table 3.1: Area Under Improved Agricultural or Natural Resources Management**

<b>STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 3:</b> Accelerated Regional Adoption of Sustainable Ag/NRM Approaches <b>APPROVED:</b> 15/AUG/1997 <b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> USAID/RCSA			
<b>RESULT NAME:</b> Accelerated Regional Adoption of Sustainable Ag/NRM Approaches			
<b>INDICATOR:</b> Area Under Improved Agricultural or Natural Resources Management			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> thousands of hectares <b>SOURCE:</b> Mission and project reports <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> Hectares under management apply for those areas in which USAID-funded efforts take place. In the case of Natural Resources Management, it applies to those delimited areas in which NRMP is active. RCSA assumes zero baseline level (1989 for NRMP, 1984 for SMIP). <b>COMMENTS:</b> This Results Review uses the surface area under improved management which was developed for the interim strategic plan in 1995. As noted earlier, these interim indicators contained only one target related to percentage area planted to new sorghum/millet varieties. A complete set of indicators and corresponding targets for the new results framework under SO3 will be developed in 1998 which will more accurately demonstrate the spread of improved approaches as well as indicate the process and necessary conditions through which such a spread takes place. Data for Zambia are extrapolated from the total area of Game Management Areas. Agricultural data do not fully reflect the regional area under improved cassava production.	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1984(B)		CBNRM: Nil Millet: Nil Sorghum: Nil
	1994	*	CBNRM: 4,003 Millet: 70 Sorghum: 239
	1995	*	CBNRM: 5,657 Millet: 102 Sorghum: 279
	1996	*	CBNRM: 6,253 Millet: 155 Sorghum: 327
	1997	*	CBNRM: 6,907 Millet: 198 Sorghum: 330

\* This table will be modified for the R4 2001 to show results to 2003.

**Table 3.2: Stage of Development and Adoption of Policy Framework**

<b>STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 3:</b> Accelerated Regional Adoption of Sustainable Ag/NRM Approaches <b>APPROVED:</b> 15/AUG/1997 <b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> USAID/RCSA			
<b>RESULT NAME:</b> An Enabling Environment Which Provides Increased Incentives for Smallholders to Adopt Sustainable Ag/NRM Technologies and Approaches			
<b>INDICATOR:</b> Adoption of Policy Framework			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Stage of Development and Adoption <b>SOURCE:</b> USAID Mission Reports <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> Policy frameworks for both agriculture and natural resources management will be developed. The stages are: 1) task force(s) constituted for reviewing policies that constrain Ag/NRM development; 2) draft policy framework prepared; 3) policy framework approved; 4) policy framework implemented. <b>COMMENTS:</b> Targets will be refined following consultations with SADC and other regional actors in 1998.	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1997(B)		None
	1999	Task force constituted	
	2000	Draft Policy Framework	
	2003(T)	Policy Framework approved and implementation begun	

## **Special Objective A: Increased Regional Capacity to Manage Transboundary Natural Resources**

### **Purpose and Background of the Objective:**

Stakeholders consulted during the development of USAID's regional Strategy for Southern Africa in 1996-1997 identified water as the single most important issue in NRM meriting regional cooperation, and having high potential for regional conflict if not addressed adequately. Southern Africa is a water-scarce region, and virtually all of the rivers cross international boundaries. Migratory wildlife pose similar management problems. Furthermore, transboundary conservation areas present a target of opportunity for USAID to help Southern Africa build on its excellent record of setting aside areas for conservation, and to support resource management planning that provides for protection and sustainable use of the region's biodiversity and wildlife.

Despite the need and interest, there is limited capacity within national governments and regional institutions to tackle the often complicated legal and technical issues associated with the management of transboundary natural resources. RCSA responded to expressed stakeholder concerns by establishing this SpO in mid-1997. The critical gaps in capacity to manage transboundary natural resources (TBNR) will be addressed in three ways: regional institutions will be strengthened (IR1), national capacity in key areas increased (IR2) and models for improved TBNR management developed (IR3).

**Progress To Date:** Since the management of transboundary resources is a new area of involvement both for USAID and for the Southern Africa region, RCSA efforts to date have focused on working with Southern Africans to gain a better understanding of the dimensions of the problems and the opportunities for intervention. Although this special objective has yet to receive dedicated funding, a solid foundation for future action

has been established. Accomplishments under this SpO have met Mission expectations. RCSA has utilized the results of a major regional water sector assessment (known as the "Stanley Report") completed by USAID/Zimbabwe in 1995, as the basis for considerable discussion with governments, donors and non-governmental organizations as well as with SADC on priority needs at the regional and national levels. This document also has provided the background material for subsequent regional discussion and other donor priority-setting activities in the region. In early FY 1998, RCSA issued a questionnaire to over 100 key informants in the region to update the information contained in that report and to prioritize recommended interventions. The updated results will help guide RCSA decisions on future efforts to increase capacity to manage regional water resources.

In addition, RCSA collaborated with SADC on holding a stakeholders' workshop in June of 1997 which prioritized policy interventions for implementing the regional Protocol on Management of Shared Watercourses. Through follow-up consultations with SADC, immediate needs for training and technical assistance to implement the Water Protocol have been identified and preliminary scopes of work for USAID assistance drafted. Work will begin as soon as FY 1998 funding is available.

RCSA joined the ongoing dialogue among governments, regional NGOs and other donors on the opportunities and priorities for establishing transboundary conservation areas in the region. RCSA intends to work closely with these partners on initiatives that are clearly African-led. RCSA co-funded an international conference on transboundary parks held in South Africa in September of 1997 under the auspices of IUCN and the Peace Parks Foundation, and a follow-up

regional workshop by the Southern Africa Sustainable Use Group. The latter resulted in the creation of a working group of regional experts and organizations interested in pursuing these initiatives. Several transfrontier conservation areas have been proposed and some are under development. To further advance these efforts, RCSA will fund a planned study to document the lessons learned internationally which are relevant to Southern Africa, as well as documenting the institutional, policy and resource constraints and opportunities to establishing transfrontier conservation areas in the region.

Significant steps have been taken in the region in the last year in relation to the management of transboundary natural resources. The SADC Protocol on Shared Watercourse Systems is on the verge of being ratified by most of the SADC countries after substantive issues were resolved at a Protocol Implementation Workshop last year. By becoming parties to the Water Protocol, SADC members with shared watercourse systems assume clear obligations to develop river basin commissions and to manage shared waters in a sustainable manner. At present, there are few functioning river basin commissions in the region to develop these plans. However, after not meeting regularly for several years, the Okavango River Basin Commission (OKACOM) has begun to hold regular meetings with all three riparian countries (Botswana, Namibia and Angola) in attendance. These meetings have led to a diagnostic assessment which is currently compiling the state of knowledge in the basin. Following this assessment, OKACOM intends to develop a strategic action plan leading ultimately to an integrated basin-wide management plan. Master plans also have been proposed for several international river basins in the region, including the Limpopo, the Maputo, the Umbeluzi, the Save, the Buzi and the Incomati. Although a river basin commission has yet to be organized for the

most dominant river in the region -- the Zambezi -- the legal arrangements for establishing it are being drafted. Under the Zambezi River Action Plan several activities are underway, including the development of a basin-wide database on sectors relevant to the management of the basin.

Formed in late 1996, the SADC Water Sector Coordinating Unit is now staffed and has a functional office in Maseru, Lesotho. It has launched several regional projects, including the establishment of an efficient system for hydrometeorological data processing and dissemination, a Capacity Building Project, a Regional Groundwater Management Project and is collaborating with the United Nations Development Programme on a "roundtable" process to establish national and regional water investment priorities.

The Governments of Botswana and South Africa have joined together to create the first transborder park in the region -- the Kalahari Transfrontier Conservation Area, linking South Africa's Gemsbok-Kalahari National Park with Botswana's Gemsbok National Park which will open officially in the spring of 1998. This combined area supports large numbers of animals typical of the arid Southern Kalahari, and has the potential to capitalize on an already flourishing tourist trade. Other transfrontier conservation areas are in varying stages of planning including several in Mozambique bordering on South Africa and Zimbabwe.

Regarding migratory wildlife, SADC, through its Wildlife Sector Coordinating Unit, has drafted a protocol with respect to control of poaching, and has expressed an interest in developing a regional protocol on migratory wildlife management. It is clear that improved collaboration among countries is needed to slow or reverse the dramatic declines in wildlife numbers noted over the past decade. One example of the current problem is the

Government of Botswana's construction of a veterinary control fence along its border with Namibia in response to an outbreak of the deadly cattle lung disease in 1995, which has prevented the normal seasonal movement of wildlife between the Okavango Delta in Botswana and the Caprivi Strip in Namibia. The Namibian Ministry of Environment and Tourism is deeply concerned that the barrier will reduce the viability of the West Caprivi Game Reserve and undermine the investment of several donors, including USAID, which are supporting community-based natural resource management and development activities in the Caprivi region. Currently, the Government of Botswana is considering mitigation options for various sections of the fence.

Despite the significant steps made in the management of transboundary natural resources in the last several years in the region, a significant lack of capacity to manage these efforts and associated negotiations remains, both at a national and regional level. Furthermore, the capacity that does exist is not evenly distributed throughout the region, with the highest concentration by far in South Africa.

#### **Expected Progress Through FY 2000:**

RCSA believes that it can make solid progress toward the achievement of this special objective by FY 2000, although funding for this objective will only begin in FY 1998. Our confidence is due to the good working relationships that have been established with regional partners, and the strong interest in pursuing the activities that have been identified. In addition, the favorable regional trends described above support this prognosis. Table A.1 shows the progress that RCSA expects to achieve over the next few years with regard to implementing these protocols, which would demonstrate an increased capacity in the region institutions to manage transboundary natural resources. Depending on the level of resources available for this

special objective, RCSA may limit its involvement to only one of the three transboundary natural resources identified for possible support (water, wildlife, or transfrontier conservation areas). RCSA anticipates that a successful conclusion of capacity building assistance and studies by the year 1999 will enable RCSA to convert this SpO to a SO, with more clearly defined targets.

To achieve these targets, RCSA will provide technical assistance to SADC's Water Sector Unit in such areas as the finalization of protocol annexes, the definition of watershed boundaries, the drafting of guidelines for river basin management and the harmonization of national water laws with the protocol. RCSA will also fund workshops for regional stakeholders to discuss the new arrangements. Assistance will also be provided to SADC for the drafting and ratification of protocols related to migratory wildlife and transboundary park management, as requested. In addition to work with SADC, the involvement and capacity of regional NGOs working on transboundary resource management will be increased through RCSA's STRENGTH activity. RCSA anticipates a doubling of the number of effective NGO interventions in transboundary resource management by the year 2000, a second performance measure under IR1.

Another facet of USAID's effort to increase regional capacity to manage TBNR will address key constraints at the country level (IR2), in those countries where the ability to negotiate international agreements effectively is particularly limited. Priority training needs identified in the "Stanley Report," and validated by follow-up analysis, are in international water law, conflict resolution, ecological aspects of international river basin management and demand management applied to water resources as alternatives to large-scale water supply schemes. RCSA plans to

conduct training for up to 25 participants from target governments and other institutions in each of the above subject areas by late 1999. Further training needs related to wildlife and transfrontier conservation area management will be identified during FY 1998 and will be addressed depending on the level of funding received.

No clear-cut replicable model or models of transboundary natural resource management have as yet emerged in Southern Africa or elsewhere. But regional initiatives such as Joint Water Commissions, Sector Coordinating Units and the new Transfrontier Conservation Areas serve to illustrate that a serious commitment exists in the region towards improving ways of managing transboundary resources. Most of these regional initiatives provide the basis upon which lessons can be

learned towards developing models for improved TBNR. Over the next two years, RCSA will endeavor to document and discuss with Southern Africans the lessons learned in other regions and will initiate a pilot activity to introduce promising management arrangements. These activities may include work in USAID non-presence countries. Under IR3, RCSA intends to identify at least two promising models by the year 2000 and to apply them in at least one geographic area. If the work over the next two years demonstrates that USAID can achieve even greater results in transboundary resource management over the longer term, it is anticipated that this SpO will become a SO. Table A.3 below indicates that, in this eventuality, RCSA expects to achieve the adoption of improved models of transboundary natural resource management in three geographic locations by the year 2003.

**Table A.1: Summary Status of SADC TBNR Protocols (Water and Wildlife)**

<b>SPECIAL OBJECTIVE A:</b> Increased Regional Capacity to Manage Transboundary Natural Resources <b>APPROVED:</b> 15/AUG/1997 <b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> USAID/RCSA			
<b>RESULT NAME:</b> Increased Regional Capacity to Manage Transboundary Natural Resources			
<b>INDICATOR:</b> Steps Taken Towards Making TBNR Protocols Operational			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Stages of Protocol Development and Implementation <b>SOURCE:</b> SADC <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> There are at least two protocols, one for water and one for wildlife. The stages are: Protocol drafting, signing by member countries, ratification by at least two thirds of member states, policy and legal constraints identified and reformed and implementation. <b>COMMENTS:</b> The SADC Protocol on Shared Watercourse Systems has not been ratified but the Water Sector Coordinating Unit has started working on projects that support the goals of the Protocol. Similarly, the SADC Protocol on Wildlife, has not been ratified but various activities are under way through the Wildlife Technical Coordinating Unit in Malawi.	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1997(B)		Water protocol signed by all SADC countries except Angola, & ratified by 6 countries; wildlife in early draft
	1998	Water protocol ratified by two thirds. Wildlife protocol ready for signing.	
	1999	Water basin boundaries delineated. Legal and policy constraints identified. Wildlife protocol signed by 8 countries.	
	2000	Wildlife protocol ratified by two thirds. National policy and legal systems in harmony with water protocol in 7 countries.	
	2003(T)	Management arrangements in place for 3 water basins and/or 3 conservation areas.	

**Table A.2: NGOs Involved in TBNR Management**

<b>SPECIAL OBJECTIVE A:</b> Increased Regional Capacity to Manage Transboundary Natural Resources <b>APPROVED:</b> 15/AUG/1997 <b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> USAID/RCSA			
<b>RESULT NAME:</b> Regional Institutions Strengthened			
<b>INDICATOR:</b> Number of Regional NGOs Actively Involved in TBNR Management			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number of NGOs <b>SOURCE:</b> USAID/RCSA, NGOs <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> The criteria for determining an active NGO include: intensity of activities, number of centers in the region and number of staff. <b>COMMENTS:</b> The enumeration of NGOs was not comprehensive. A comprehensive list will be developed during 1998.	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1997(B)		7
	1998	10	
	1999	12	
	2000(T)	14	

**Table A.3: Adoption of Selected TBNR Best Practices**

<b>SPECIAL OBJECTIVE A:</b> Increased Regional Capacity to Manage Transboundary Natural Resources <b>APPROVED:</b> 15/AUG/1997 <b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> USAID/RCSA			
<b>RESULT NAME:</b> Models for Improved TBNRM Developed			
<b>INDICATOR:</b> Adoption of Selected TBNRM Best Practices			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Stages of Development and Adoption <b>SOURCE:</b> USAID, SADC and Regional NGOs <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> TBNR management is a new concept in the region and formal agreements and strategies are just now being developed. Best practices will be documented as they develop and adoption rates assessed. <b>COMMENTS:</b> A more comprehensive assessment will be carried out in 1998 under the USAID/RCSA Performance Monitoring Plan. Several studies to define best practices will be carried out, including one on transfrontier conservation areas.	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1997(B)		None
	1999	Two best practices (River Basin Management and Transfrontier Conservation Management) identified.	
	2003(T)	At least 3 river basin and 3 transfrontier conservation adoptions of best practices.	



## **Special Objective B: Create Capacity for More Informed Regional Decision Making**

### **Purpose and Background of the Objective:**

RCSA designed this Special Objective with the goal of developing, both within the Mission and in the region as a whole, a coherent and comprehensive basis for accurately assessing “regional” interests and impacts related to decisions made at both the regional and national levels. As agreed upon with USAID/Washington (USAID/W) in RCSA’s Management Contract, this SpO has two phases. The purpose of Phase I is to provide RCSA with the tools necessary to monitor, evaluate and assess the impact of its development programs.

Phase II is conditional and will occur only if potential Southern African partners exhibit a genuine belief in the potential value of this activity and a commitment to provide ongoing leadership in designing and implementing it. RCSA intends to play a facilitative role only in this endeavor, with one or more Southern African institutions taking the lead and ultimately “owning” both the process and the products.

If Phase II does occur, this SpO will explore ways to develop the regional capacity within Southern Africa to define, analyze and measure progress toward regional development goals. During Phase II, RCSA and its partners will design systems which increase regional capacity to monitor progress toward sustainable regional development goals, analyze regional trends, develop regional benchmarks as opposed to simply aggregating national sector-level data and develop mechanisms which support the concept of a “regional vision.” This vision aspires to develop in the region an indigenous capacity to research, analyze and measure progress toward regional development goals. RCSA anticipates this would require working both

sectorally and, if possible, in an integrated multi-sectoral manner to support development of information and analyses of regional issues by knowledgeable Southern Africans from the public and private sectors. While both process and product will be driven by Southern African conclusions as to the most valuable avenues to take, among the results RCSA would hope for, would be development of a credible, integrated set of social, political, economic and ecological indicators to permit better assessment of the region’s problems and successes in addressing issues affecting the region.

**Progress To Date:** Under this SpO RCSA’s top priority during the first year following approval of the Strategy has been to meet its own internal monitoring and evaluation needs. The Center is actively engaged in the development and implementation of an impact assessment, monitoring and evaluation system for the ISA. This evaluation system is presently at the stage of designing indicators, baseline and performance targets at the sub-goal, strategic objective, special objective and intermediate results levels, as reflected in this report. With the technical assistance of an institutional contractor, RCSA is identifying a full-range of resources and support services for measuring, analyzing and monitoring program impact and performance. These include identifying resources in the region to supply analyses on specific topic areas in order to evaluate the impact of RCSA’s Strategy. Performance is being monitored in the economic, democratic, agricultural and ecological development sectors. The contractor is also working with the teams to establish linkages to monitoring and evaluation efforts of grantee and contractor activities and recommending steps needed to align grantee and contractor activities to the Mission

performance monitoring plan. Performance under this Objective has met Mission expectations.

**Expected Progress in FY 1998:** Expected progress under this Objective for FY 1998 will be the finalization of the RCSA Performance Monitoring Plan for the duration of the Strategy period. The Plan will also consolidate the monitoring and evaluation systems of RCSA's grantees and contractors as they relate to the RCSA portfolio into a coherent system for regular tracking, monitoring and evaluation, and impact assessment of results that are crucial for effective and comprehensive performance monitoring. Key to the Plan is the need for RCSA to: 1) continue to identify gaps in performance monitoring and evaluation as necessary to perform an effective results review; 2) identify, collect and verify data for indicators at the sub-goal, strategic objective and intermediate result level; 3) develop and implement a capacity-building program to assist RCSA partners to understand and use RCSA's results framework and results review process for their own program management; and 4) obtain input from intermediate customers and/or partners on progress made during the period on performance baseline and targets at the intermediate result and objective level.

An important tool in understanding RCSA's Performance Monitoring Plan for our contractor, grantee and stakeholder community will be the development and dissemination of a Guidebook on RCSA Impact Assessment, Performance Monitoring and Evaluation. This Guidebook will help our partners understand RCSA's results frameworks, the performance monitoring and evaluation system, and the results report and resource request requirements. The Guidebook will also be developed with the participation of our partners and the decisions about the scope and format of the guidebook will emanate from

consultations with the SO Teams and their partners, contractors and grantees.

In FY 1998, RCSA will finalize the Mission Customer Service Plan, begun by the Strategic Objective Teams. As part of the development of the Mission Customer Service Plan, RCSA intends to develop and disseminate information packages on RCSA Program Impact. These packages will be short informational reports used to respond to requests for information about the USAID/RCSA program from SADC, the general public and RCSA's partners, customers and stakeholders.

Beginning late FY 1998 and continuing through FY 1999, RCSA plans to host roundtable discussions with current partners and other Southern Africans to confirm the feasibility of Phase II of the Special Objective, brainstorm on possible approaches of achievement and develop a plan of action. Through this process, RCSA would both learn how to make participation in achieving the Special Objective attractive to the busy leaders who could make the greatest contribution to it and begin to secure commitments to participate from a core cadre of governmental, business, civil society/non-governmental, academic, SADC and other leaders from around the region.

**Expected Progress Post-2000:** Some of the anticipated outcomes under this Special Objective will be valuable even if Phase II is not fully implemented: solid and comparable regional baseline data, analyses of the fundamental relationships and tradeoffs among Southern African development goals and an integrated set of development indicators and targets will all remain valuable resources for several years. Other results -- such as networks developed to support a "Sustainable Southern Africa" project -- will be of high value if RCSA has been successful in institutionalizing this Special Objective. Such a project could combine the wide-ranging

database, holistic approach, soundly-based indicators and credibility that would ensure maximum impact on the public and other decision makers. Analyses enjoying substantial authority within the region and serving as an important resource for decision makers and the public would be a key performance milestone.

**Donor Coordination:** As a result of the regional nature of the RCSA portfolio and because of the general dearth of regional information available for monitoring development progress, this activity will require close coordination with other donors, SADC, USAID bilateral missions in Southern Africa and Southern African partners and stakeholders to develop a comprehensive monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment system. In

accordance with its Strategy, RCSA anticipates relying heavily on Southern Africans and Southern African institutions in the development of methodologies for measuring achievement of its regional programmatic goals. Broad participatory inclusion of Southern Africans is a key tenet of this activity.

**Customer/Partner/Stakeholder Participation:** This SpO will support a systematic and highly participatory process through which Southern Africans would develop information, conduct analyses and design an integrated set of indicators to permit better assessment of the region's development challenges and success in addressing issues affecting the region.

**Table B.1: Level of Development and Implementation of the Monitoring and Evaluation System**

<b>SPECIAL OBJECTIVE B:</b> Capacity for More Informed Regional Decision Making Created at Regional Level <b>APPROVED:</b> 15/AUG/1997 <b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> USAID/RCSA			
<b>RESULT NAME:</b> RCSA Using Performance And Impact Assessment Data For Program Management			
<b>INDICATOR:</b> Consolidated Performance Monitoring System In Place At RCSA			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Status of the M&E System <b>SOURCE:</b> RCSA Program Office and SO teams <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> Level of development and implementation of M&E system will be assessed semi-annually. <b>COMMENTS:</b> Development of the consolidated system is expected to be completed by the end of FY 1998. After this, data collection, analysis and reporting will be carried out as an on-going process. The extent to which this information is used for program management and R4 reporting will be assessed by customers from all sides.	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1997(B)		Draft Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) completed. Preliminary establishment of Baseline values and Target setting completed
	1998	PMP finalized based on feedback on R4. Semi-annual Performance Review reporting process reviewed and implemented.	
	1999	Semi-annual Performance Reviews completed. Draft of R4 results review component completed four weeks prior to Washington submission.	
	2000	Semi-annual Performance Reviews completed. Draft of R4 results review component completed four weeks prior to Washington submission.	
	2003(T)	Semi-annual Performance Reviews completed. Draft of R4 results review component completed four weeks prior to Washington submission.	

**Table B.2: Status of Development and Implementation of a Review Process for the Achievement of Pre-set Performance Targets in Southern Africa*****(APPLICABLE TO PHASE 2 ONLY)***

<b>SPECIAL OBJECTIVE B:</b> Capacity for More Informed Regional Decision Making Created at Regional Level			
<b>APPROVED:</b> 15/AUG/1997 <b>COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION:</b> USAID/RCSA			
<b>RESULT NAME:</b> Capacity for More Informed Regional Decision Making Created at Regional Level			
<b>INDICATOR:</b> System Established for Annual Performance Reviews at Regional Level			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Stage of development and implementation <b>SOURCE:</b> Regional policy and management units <b>INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:</b> When the system is in place, assessment will be carried out every year to find out whether performance was reviewed consistently. <b>COMMENTS:</b> Developing M&E systems at regional level is not expected to begin until 1999 when Southern Africans have come together and developed a strategy for improving the decision making process.	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PLANNED</b>	<b>ACTUAL</b>
	1997(B)		Performance targets not set hence no reviews being undertaken
	1998	Need for development of a regional-level performance review system assessed	
	1999	Consultative process to define goals, objectives, and institutional roles and responsibilities completed	
	2000	Performance targets set	
	2003(T)	Annual review of achievement towards pre-set performance targets carried out	

## RCSA Environmental Compliance Statement

USAID/RCSA is cognizant of its statutory obligations under ADS 204.5.3 as it relates to 22 CFR 216 ("Reg 16"). During 1997, Initial Environmental Evaluations (IEEs) were conducted for RAPID and the Botswana component of the NRMP. The IEE for the NRMP specified a series of steps, in accordance with Africa Bureau's *Environmental Guidelines for Small-Scale Activities in Africa*, to ensure the adequate review of sub-grants. Accordingly, grantee staff and counterparts have taken part in training courses sponsored by Africa Bureau and have implemented an environmental review process. The Mission has also developed an *Environmental Manual* to be applied by the Southern Africa Enterprise Development Fund for the evaluation of environmental impacts and risk associated with its funding activities. Further, the RCSA Environmental Officer continues to provide Mission staff with guidance on the importance of and procedures to be followed in the Environmental Review process for USAID programs as required by law.

Current plans for the design of activities in 1998 do not indicate that IEEs will be necessary, with the possible exception of the STRENGTH activity. Sub-grants issued under STRENGTH will be subjected to environmental review as outlined in the above mentioned *Guidelines*. RCSA will remain alert to the need to conduct environmental reviews at such time as deemed necessary should new design activities take place or changes occur in the potential level of environmental impact of existing activities.

RCSA will take advantage of its Monitoring, Evaluation and Impact Assessment (IMPACT) activity which is responsible for RCSA monitoring and evaluation to develop, with SO teams, environmental monitoring and evaluation information systems in order to ensure full compliance with 22 CFR 216, as outlined in ADS sections 204.3.3 and 204.5.3. RCSA may request the assistance of AFR/SD and REDSO/ESA in order to accomplish this.

## **Part III**

### **Status of Management Contract**

The Strategy reported on above was approved by USAID/W during RCSA Program Week in June 1997. An exchange of cables between AFR and RCSA followed in August and October 1997 which identified key elements of the proposed management contract governing implementation of the approved Strategy. Issues raised in these cables and the issues raised below need to be resolved before a management contract is concluded between USAID/W and RCSA. These elements are listed below, with a brief status report on each.

#### **General Programmatic Issues and Concerns**

##### **1. Assumption of Regional Stability**

As reported above in Part I, the assumption of regional stability has held up during this period, and indeed regional actors have displayed an increasing willingness to engage in a variety of ways to defuse regional conflict or even conflict at national levels which are seen as affecting neighbors in the region. This remains compelling evidence of a resilient "regional community" willing and able to lobby and/or collaborate to preserve the stability that is recognized as one of the region's most valuable assets.

As requested in the management contract, RCSA is monitoring the region's "stresses and strains" closely and has reported on these in the Overview section. It also continues to look for opportunities in its programming choices under each of its SOs and SpOs to provide technical and other assistance to equip regional actors with information and other tools to mitigate conflict, manage crises and enhance collaborative problem-solving in each of the specific sectors addressed in the Strategy. One example is mediation training

for Mozambicans through SARDF. Another example is in the area of disaster preparedness: RCSA-facilitated Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance/Department of Defense regional training in disaster preparedness in Botswana. The Center has also worked behind the scenes to facilitate mediation by SADC of the issue of veterinary defenses, particularly along the Botswana-Namibia border. As a result, agreement was reached for Botswana to leave a gap to permit wildlife to migrate between the two countries.

##### **2. Strategic Coordination**

RCSA has been proactive in promoting greater coordination with and between the bilateral missions in the region, AFR/SD, and REDSO/ESA. The Center has continued our practices of reporting quarterly by cable on progress under each SO and of convening meetings of the Southern African mission directors whenever practicable. RCSA has maintained active collaboration and information sharing on specific projects and partners where there are common interests (studies on comparative advantage and cross-border trade, determining the feasibility of a regional agricultural commodity exchange and COMESA, SACCAR, CBNRM, agricultural technology dissemination, SADC Food Security Unit and FEWS).

Considerable progress has also been made in developing mechanisms for more systematic collaboration in planning and implementation. Work is now underway to inventory all projects on-going in the region -- whether funded by bilateral missions, regional programs, or Global Bureau -- which contribute to USAID's goal of increased trade and investment in the region. This inventory

will form the basis for developing a strategic framework which defines the linkages among the activities and identifies any duplication of effort or programming gaps in our combined programs.

Likewise, RCSA has collaborated closely with AFR/SD in the development of a parallel effort in the Ag/NRM arena.

Finally, RCSA staff from SOs 2 and 3 organized and participated actively in a strategic coordination meeting held in Kampala in February 1998, at the conclusion of the Ag/NRM/Private Sector Officer conference. This meeting resulted in agreement to better share information that is being developed by contractors reporting to RCSA and AFR/SD, establishing a network to update one another in the trade and investment area and working on a unified approach to trade and investment by RCSA and AFR/SD.

### 3. Impact of HIV/AIDS

As agreed in the exchange of cables, RCSA will continue to monitor the HIV/AIDS pandemic in the region and provide any analyses which are done on regional impact to AFR/SD for use in its own research work. RCSA remains sensitive to the potential impact HIV/AIDS may have on key elements of RCSA Strategy, especially insofar as it affects the availability of skilled workers, in turn reducing the ability of both private and public sector to promote trade, investment and economic growth.

### 4. SO 1 Issues

SO1 is essentially "qualitative" in that it is difficult, if not impossible, to ascribe specific, concrete changes in national DG practices within the region to the "influence" which it seeks to expand. As agreed during Program

Week and in RCSA's reply to the cable approving the Strategy, innovative and experimental reporting methods are required to capture success in achieving this SO. While data now available does not permit substantive reporting at the IR level, the RCSA's SO- and IR level indicators will correspond closely to those presented in the Strategy document and approved by USAID/W and in RCSA's view, fully meet USAID/W expectations and RCSA reporting obligations under SO 1.

RCSA has little or no control over achievement of IR 4, "Continued Support and Strengthening at National Level of Civil Society and Governmental Democracy Advocates." USAID's contribution is made by bilateral missions and not by RCSA. Because its activities (as opposed to those of USAID bilaterals) do not contribute to achieving this IR, *RCSA will, in the future, treat this strategic element as a critical assumption rather than an IR.*

### 5. SO 1 Funding Level

AFR has proposed reducing 1999 funding for SO1 from an approved level of \$3 million to \$1 million. No substantive reasons for the cut have been cited in response to RCSA's August reclama, but RCSA assumes it was not performance based as there has been no performance reporting since the Strategy had only been approved a few weeks earlier. Not only is the proposed \$1 million below the \$3 million level approved in RCSA's Strategy, but well below the \$2 million which the Strategy expressly stated was the minimum resource level required to conduct SO1 under the approved design. This cut requires a fundamental review of our ability to implement the Strategy and achieve the results approved in August.



In light of USAID/W silence on this point, RCSA has been compelled to consider modifying the key SO1 SARDF activity to permit retention of core Strategy concepts consistent with expected funding uncertainties. (See SO1 narrative). Such modifications could reduce administrative costs, but would require increased in-house RCO capability. Formal RCSA concurrence to the proposed management contract must await either restoration of approved minimum funding levels or determination that major administrative savings are feasible consistent with core SO1 strategic elements. (FY 1999 "Request" level of \$1 million shown in Part IV, Resources Request is the control level mandated by USAID/W. It does not reflect the minimum required for FY 1999).

## **6. SO2 Foreign Investment**

RCSA has included in the draft Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) a plan for collecting and tracking data on foreign direct investment (FDI) in the SADC region.

## **7. SO2 Participation in the AFR T&I Initiative Team**

RCSA appreciates being kept informed on progress in planning and implementing the T&I Initiative (now the Africa Trade and Investment Program). Temporary Duty travel to Botswana from AFR/SD and AFR/SA has been instrumental in promoting information exchange.

## **8. SO3 CBNRM Review**

The SO3 team has been in close contact with participating bilateral missions on the proposed scope of work for a regional review of CBNRM. A SOW is being reviewed in the region and work is expected to begin in May 1998, with an initial draft completed by July

1998. The assessment will focus on the question of whether the CBNRM model, as developed and applied under the NRMP and its bilateral components (Botswana, Namibia, Zambia and Zimbabwe), can be sustainable, in institutional and financial terms, while also having the expected resource conservation benefit.

## **9. SO3 Collaboration with AFR/SD and REDSO**

The SO3 team has benefitted greatly from the support and engagement by AFR/SD in efforts to bring more focus to RCSA's proposed portfolio of activities in Ag/NRM. While concrete decisions on portfolio focus under SO3 must await completion of the CBNRM Assessment and the development of the Regional NRM Strategic Framework, the dialogue with AFR/SD has produced a much greater commitment to and understanding of the potential synergies which exist between the two programs, and greater degree of consensus on where our respective comparative advantages lie.

RCSA continues to work closely with REDSO/ESA on analytical work on informal trade and agricultural comparative advantage which RCSA funded through two REDSO cooperative agreements. Field data collection is nearly complete and the results to date are now being discussed with policy makers in several countries. However, there is a need to develop an improved collaboration mechanism between RCSA and REDSO/ESA before further work can proceed.

## **10. SO3 Environmental Earmark**

Although planned financial resources for SO3 should enable RCSA to achieve planned results under the IRs over the course of the Strategy, these results will be jeopardized if

the funding mix does not include a greater percentage of economic growth funding for agricultural activities than has been projected. This SO cannot be achieved solely with funds attributed toward the environment earmark.

### **11. SpOB Collaboration with Bilateral Missions in Regional Trends Analysis and Decision-Making**

As agreed in the management contract, RCSA will seek to engage the participation of bilateral missions in the region as partners in carrying out Phase II of this Special Objective. One of the purposes of this collaboration will be ultimately to be able to report in a comprehensive fashion on the impact of all USAID activities underway in the region which are contributing to the broad goals of DG, Trade and Investment and Ag/NRM. This work can only begin once RCSA PMP is finalized in late FY 1998. As indicated in the RCSA response cable, this task is not one that RCSA believes it can take on itself, but needs to be carefully planned and supported with full collaboration by AFR/SD and bilateral missions.

Another purpose is to ensure consultation and collaboration on issues which affect the success of all USAID development efforts in the region. A positive example of the benefits of such consultation is the collaboration of the USAID bilateral missions, RCSA and regional partners concerning the response to the anticipated effects of El Niño during this crop year. In response to effective leadership by AFR/SA, RCSA helped bilateral missions in the region to stay informed about developments in the region's commodity and financial markets and on policy measures being discussed and/or implemented affecting grain trade in the region.

### **12. Staffing and OE Resources**

RCSA has made considerable progress in recruitment of staff against the workforce levels approved in the management contract. Recruitment has been completed or is well advanced for all pending positions approved in the management contract. Of the agreed upon staffing level of 90, 82 are on board and 8 more are expected to come on board, or be selected, within the next two months.

However, without an increase over the OE budget authorized in FY 1998, RCSA will remain unable to operate effectively without management vulnerabilities. This will require RCSA to again review what program and/or administrative responsibilities are needed to be dropped in order to operate within the OE constraints. (See Section IV for additional detail.)

### **13. Regional Support Services**

In response to the continued workforce constraints at RCSA reported in the Strategy, the management contract approved RCSA's proposal to transfer from RCSA 1) contracting services for the Malawi and Zambia missions, and 2) the accounting services for the Angola office, pending final approval of the Bureau Budget Submission. As of the date of this R4, neither action has been taken. RCSA does, however, have agreement to transfer the Angola accounting services to USAID/South Africa as of the end of May. No agreement is yet in sight to provide additional contracting support to permit USAID/Malawi to assume their own and USAID/Zambia's contracting responsibilities, leaving RCSA with an unsustainable workload which has meant serious delays in the implementation of programs for both RCSA and client missions.

This issue received serious attention at the recent Southern African Mission Directors' Conference and will be discussed further in the context of the Bureau's budget reviews.

Recognizing the absolute shortage of USDH Contracting Officers, RCSA plans to recruit a USPSC contracting officer as the only near-term solution to this increasingly serious problem. If this cannot be done due to OE

constraints, RCSA will need to take dramatic action to reduce the demand on the RCO, which will have to include postponing initiation of any new programs under the approved Strategy until FY 1999 or later, or imposing essentially arbitrary restrictions on the size and number of competitive actions which are requested of the RCO by its clients. ***This is the most serious issue facing RCSA. Unless it is resolved, we simply cannot implement the approved Strategy.***

## ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AFRONET	Inter-African Network For Human Rights
Ag/NRM	Agriculture/Natural Resource Management
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
CBNRM	Community-Based Natural Resource Management
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DG	Democracy and Governance
EU	European Union
FEWS	Famine Early Warning System
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
HPI	Human Poverty Index
IEE	Initial Environmental Evaluation
IMPACT	Monitoring, Evaluation and Impact Assessment
ISPs	Internet Service Providers
ISA	Initiative for Southern Africa
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
MISA	Media Institute of Southern Africa
NETCAB	Networking and Capacity Building Initiative
NRMP	Natural Resource Management Project
NRMP/LIFE	Natural Resource Management Project/Living in a Finite Environment
OKACOM	Okavango River Basin Commission
RAPID	Regional Activity to Promote Integration Through Dialogue and Policy Implementation
RCSA	Regional Center for Southern Africa
REDSO/ESA	Regional Economic Dev't Services Office/East and Southern Africa
SACCAR	Southern Africa Center for Co-operation in Agriculture and Natural Resources Research and Training
SACU	Southern African Customs Union
SADC	Southern Africa Development Community
SAEDF	Southern Africa Enterprise Development Fund
SAHRINGON	Southern Africa Human Rights NGO Network
SARDC	Southern Africa Research and Documentation Center
SARDF	Southern Africa Regional Democracy Fund
SARIPS	Southern Africa Regional Institute for Policy Studies
SARRNET	Southern Africa Root Crops Research Network
SATCC	Southern African Transport and Communications Commission
SITCD	SADC Industry and Trade Coordination Division
SME	Small and Medium Enterprise
SMIP	Sorghum and Millet Improvement Program
STRENGTH	Strengthening Regional Economies Through NGOs
SWAPO	South West Africa Peoples Organization
TBNR	Transboundary Natural Resources
WILDAF	Women In Law and Development in Southern Africa

## APPENDIX A

As required in RCSA's response to Washington's Cable, below RCSA is forwarding a regional analysis on the issue of HIV/AIDS.

### **Regional Analysis on the Issue of HIV/AIDS**

The Regional Strategy hypothesized, as a critical assumption, that there would be continued progress in addressing HIV/AIDS in the region in the public and private sectors. As the monitoring functions of the RCSA Strategy have started to come on stream this year, with critical assumption topics such as HIV/AIDS being tracked, indications are that there is a lack of planning on this topic both in individual Southern African countries and certainly on the regional level. Current AIDS national case data reflect infection levels of six or more years ago, and are hopelessly under-reported because in general, AIDS cases are not notifiable (legally reportable to the authorities), making HIV data unreliable and incomplete.

Southern Africa has some of the highest levels and most rapid spread of HIV recorded anywhere in the world. AIDS has been identified as the major cause of death of adults aged 15 to 44 in Tanzania, for example. There was shock in Botswana when the 1997 United Nations Development Program's (UNDP) Human Poverty Index (HPI) report suggested that life expectancy in Botswana has fallen in one year from 66 to 52 years, pushing Botswana from position 71 in the index to 97. For a country doing very well in other areas, policy makers and leaders were dismayed, indicating that AIDS was a fairly abstract concept for some. In Zimbabwe an estimated 22 percent of the adult population was HIV-infected with 700 deaths from AIDS-related illnesses every week. The UNDP/HPI data show that AIDS will have extremely adverse impacts on the SADC countries.

HIV/AIDS rates are high and increasing, particularly in the economically active and most highly-educated groups. The epidemic has not peaked. The extent to which prevention measures are developed and succeed and how plans are developed vary from country to country. The private sector has become involved in research and prevention programs as their work forces are affected, especially in the mining sector.

There is growing evidence that women will be more affected by the HIV epidemic and will bear a disproportionate burden for a number of reasons, ranging from women being physiologically more vulnerable to infection, to the fact that the care of the sick is the responsibility of females in households. Urban groups tend to have higher infection rates. Taking a regional view is particularly important; migration patterns between countries cause wide swings in infection rates for groupings as the disease crosses borders into rural areas.

A review of data in nations in SADC indicates major differences in reliability and how data are kept. This is an area that bears continued monitoring by RCSA and its partners. HIV/AIDS is an issue which: 1) responds to two U.S. foreign policy objectives related to population/health/preventing the spread of infectious diseases and protecting human health; 2) has both bilateral (Mozambique, Zimbabwe) and USAID/W investments in the region; and 3) could have major implications for the region, economically and socially.

## APPENDIX B

### Strategy Linkage to MPPs

RCSA is a regional center and a "Mission Performance Plan" for Southern Africa region does not exist. RCSA has, therefore, reviewed the MPP goals from Southern African countries as reported by the USAID bilateral program R4s for FY 2000 and assessed those goals that consistently recur in the reports as the U.S. Mission goals for the region.

By supporting regional players who influence national democracy and governance issues, RCSA's SO1 supports the effort of U.S. missions in the region to strengthen the pillars of democracy through creation of an independent and professional media; an independent judiciary; a strong legislature and active civic organizations. This is a priority objective of the democracy goal in most of the country MPPs. An equally important objective in the U.S. national interest economic growth goal area is the creation of an economic environment that supports increase and expansion of U.S. trade and investment in the region. Through SO2, RCSA will promote integration and opening of the regional market by strengthening policy analysis through technical assistance and increased advocacy and policy dialogue. Expected impact of this effort is increased sales of U.S. products and U.S. investment in the region.

Strengthening cooperation among Southern African states on issues that have potential for conflict in a region as important to the United States as this one, is a priority goal. Interventions under SpOA will help the region to increase its capacity to manage transborder natural resources while SO2 will advocate infrastructural collaboration and interdependence (a key word in globalization) in areas of transportation and telecommunication. By increasing capacity in the region for policy planning and management, RCSA will contribute to consolidation and increased sustainability of all these gains. Through SpOB, RCSA will encourage SADC to improve internal management and coordination and set realistic and meaningful goals, making it a more effective operational and policy unit and improving government's articulation and promotion of policy initiatives.

## APPENDIX C

### Performance Tables

RCSA has put substantive effort towards reporting on the IRs and indicators which best capture the story of progress towards planned achievement during this reporting period. These indicators are reflected in the data performance tables for each SO narrative. The following indicators are in a developmental stage by RCSA, and we welcome Washington's review and comment in developing these indicators. All indicators at both SO and IR levels will be fully developed (statement refined, data source verified, baseline established and targets set) in the Mission PMP to be completed soon.

IR	Indicator under development*		
	Statement	Definition	Data source
SO1: IR2	Increased quantity and quality of advocacy regarding DG events	customer opinion of accuracy, adequacy, quantity, usefulness, timeliness and diversity of information events	national, regional and international publications and surveys of politically active class
SO1: IR3	An increase in the number of USAID-funded common interest groups that have developed significant sets of norms and an increase in the number of norms developed	to be defined by project committee	USAID grantees: reports, conference proceedings
SO2: IR3	Discourse by groups advocating regional integration is improved	a) more private sector participation in advocacy b) more issues under discussion c) positions are articulated better d) more and wider fora for discussion e) role of advocacy groups expands to include "watchdog" function	advocacy groups; workshops; key informants
SO3: IR1	Regional institutions and networks/partnerships in place to transfer agricultural technologies and NRM across the region	a) 3 key regional institutions including SADC, IUCN ROSA b) network/partnerships include private sector, farmer associations, and i) agricultural NGOs and ii) CBNRM services NGOs	a) regional institutions, e.g., SACCAR/NARS b) networks AND partnerships c) IUCN and SADC/TCU for CBNRM d) NETCAB
SpOA: IR2	Improved local capacity to contribute to TBNR management agreements in selected countries	capacity to be defined with partners	reports from activities

**USAID/RCSA**

**REGIONAL CENTER FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA**

**FY 2000**

**PART IV  
RESOURCES REQUEST**



## Part IV

### Resources Request

#### 1. Financial Plan

Annex 1 presents the budget tables for the Years 1998, 1999 and 2000. In summary, the request calls for the following new budget resources.

#### FY 98 \$000

SO	Economic Growth	Agriculture	Environment	DG	Total
1				3,000	3,000
2	16,000				16,000
3		3,000	5,000		8,000
SpOA			2,000		2,000
SpOB	1,000				1,000
Total	17,000	3,000	7,000	3,000	30,000

#### FY 99 \$000

SO	Economic Growth	Agriculture	Environment	DG	Total
1				1,000*	1,000
2	15,600				15,600
3		1,900	7,500		9,400
SpOA			2,000		2,000
SpOB	2,000				2,000
Total	17,600	1,900	9,500	1,000*	30,000

\* See discussion Part III, on SO1 funding level.

#### FY 2000

\$000

SO	Economic Growth	Agriculture	Environment	DG	Total
1				3,000	3,000
2	15,000				15,000
3		4,000	4,000		8,000
SpOA			3,000		3,000
SpOB	1,000				1,000
Total	16,000	4,000	7,000	3,000	30,000

## 2. Prioritization of Objectives:

RCSA ranks its Strategic and Special Objectives as follows:

- 1) *SO2: A More Integrated Regional Market*
- 2) *SpOB: Create Capacity for More Informed Regional Decision Making*
- 3) *SO3: Accelerated Regional Adoption of Sustainable Agriculture and Natural Resource Management Approaches*
- 4) *SO1: Increased Regional Capacity to Influence Democratic Performance*
- 5) *SpOA: Increased Regional Capacity to Manage Transboundary Natural Resources*

In deciding upon the above rank ordering, RCSA management took into account both how each objective was performing as well as its importance to the overall strategy.

SO2 was top ranked not only because it exceeded expectations but also because of the

importance of market integration to bringing the region together as a whole. It also covers four areas of national interest for the U.S., as laid out in the "U.S. Strategic Plan for International Affairs (SPIA) U.S. National Interests" document. These four areas are: 1) Open foreign markets to free the flow of goods, services and capital, 2) Expand U.S. exports to \$1.2 trillion by 2000, 3) Increase global economic growth, and 4) Promote broad-based economic growth in developing and transition economies. The SO is well designed and activities have been identified and are being developed to further promote economic integration in the region. An integrated market brings with it increased employment and the availability of cheaper and higher quality goods directly contributing to the goal of equitable, sustainable economic growth in the region.

SpOB, while experimental, is seen by the Mission as having the potential to strongly impact on decisions that the region's policy

makers will in the years to come. Providing them with the tools to measure the performance of the region will allow them to adjust and change policies to stimulate economic growth. For these reasons, it was second ranked.

Under SO3, the research work that RCSA has supported has provided improved seed which has been planted on over 500,000 hectares by more than 2.5 million farmers. Because of the fragile nature of the renewable resource base in the SADC countries, sustainably managing them becomes increasingly important. For CBNRM, the number of hectares under improved natural resource management increased from 4 million in 1994 to 6.9 million in 1997. This SO is having a difficult time clearly defining its role in the region as well as activities that it will support. However, RCSA believes that in the next year, these uncertainties will be resolved as efforts will be undertaken to further focus the SO and develop new activities. For these reasons, this SO was ranked third.

RCSA recognizes that having strong democracies in the region is key to growth. SO1 is creating capacity to promote the democratic process in the region. Grant recipients are receiving a relatively small portion of the project funds due to the high cost of the grant making process that is in place. This will be analyzed in the coming year and recommendations made on how this process can be changed to improve efficiencies. Because of the above, this SO has been ranked fourth.

Finally, this past year has seen extensive progress being made by SpOA. There is a clear plan in place for what it will carry out, excellent working relationships have been established with key partners, scopes of work

have been drafted and will be carried out during this year. Thus, it is this following year where RCSA expects to see the results of all the work that has been put into SpOA. For this reason as well as the experimental nature of this special objective, it was ranked fifth.

### **3. Field Support**

Annex 2 contains the Global Bureau Field Support table. Field support from the Global Bureau will provide critical assistance in several areas. In FY 1998, technical assistance will be provided for a conference bringing regional customs inspectors together to begin work on drafting legislation that would standardize customs procedures and practices throughout the region, an important step in the reduction of non-tariff barriers to trade. Assistance will also be provided through a Global Bureau contract for the collection and analysis of impact data related to the Southern Africa Economic Development Fund. RCSA is requesting a AAAS Fellow to continue development of transboundary natural resources management activities under Special Objective A. A second OYB transfer will fund regional consultation and analytical work leading to recommendations on sustainable and appropriate methods for creating and managing Transfrontier Conservation Areas. In FYs 1999 and 2000, field support will provide critical technical assistance for the development of natural resources management policy within the region.

### **4. Workforce and Operating Expenses (OE) -- FY 1998 -- 2000 Operating Expense Budgets and Workforce Requirements**

Since the strategy was approved last August, important progress has been made in bringing RCSA up to the critical mass needed to carry

out its mandate, deliver the program results agreed to in the management contract, and properly support its client missions. We have hired eleven new staff in the last six months, bringing us up to 90 percent of our target staffing level (from 75 percent at the time the strategy was submitted). There has been substantial work done to establish and refine operational systems able to respond to RCSA's multiple responsibilities. The 21 employees who have joined RCSA since 1996 with no prior USAID experience (one-quarter of the staff) have benefitted from a wide range of training opportunities, from both formal classroom training on computer applications, to informal training offered by a series of TDYers in C&R, personnel management, information management, and other core functions; and of course, months of on-the-job experience. In addition, an agreement has been concluded to transfer the accounting responsibility for USAID/Angola to USAID/South Africa. This should occur by the end of May 1998.

However, we have still not reached the critical mass as laid out in the strategy, partly due to inadequate staff to accelerate and intensify remaining recruitment and training, partly due to remaining staff vacancies in key areas. Most serious of all is the continuing shortage of trained and experienced staff in our Contracting Office which, despite heroic efforts (and much overtime) by the staff, has created a serious bottleneck in implementing RCSA's and client posts and programs. As a result, we have faced significant delays in strategy implementation.

In this R4, we are requesting the OE resources to meet this remaining shortfall. RCSA's current authorized OE budget for 1998 is \$3.0 million plus projected ICASS costs of \$84,000. This is approximately \$200,000 less

than the amount of OE budgeted in our Strategic Plan, approved in August 1997. RCSA is able to operate within this lower level through FY 1998 principally through savings in staff salaries and benefits, as new staff have not been hired as quickly as planned.

However, since we have recently filled many of the positions and are continuing to hire, we will need more than the current authorized level for FYs 1999 and beyond. In 1999, we are requesting an OE budget of \$3.4 million, which is \$320,000 above our actual 1998 level. The funds are primarily required to meet the salaries of FSN and USPSC staff we need to fulfill our responsibilities and overcome management vulnerabilities. All but two of these unfunded positions were included in the target staff level approved during our strategy review.

The two positions being proposed in this R4 but not covered in the Strategic Plan are a US PSC Contracting Officer and a USDH Contracting Officer. Our Contracting Office services USAID/Namibia, USAID/Zimbabwe, USAID/Malawi and USAID/Zambia as well as RCSA and, because of chronic shortages in trained and experienced staff, it simply can not perform the work for which it is responsible in a timely manner. This has resulted in serious delays in the implementation of the Missions? programs. The Contracting Office has tried to compensate by increasing its overtime, and by relying on TDY support from USAID/W as well as short-term USPSC contractors. Although this has helped immeasurably in our ability to cope with the growing workload, the lack of continuity has blunted the effectiveness of this approach.

The Contracting Office staffing issue was raised in last year's R4 as well as in the Strategic Plan, when RCSA proposed

transferring the Contracting responsibility for USAID/Zambia to REDSO/ESA. The Africa Bureau took this a step further and approved, as part of our Strategic Plan, the transfer of contracting services for both USAID/Zambia and USAID/Malawi to USAID/Malawi.

However, there has been no progress in identifying a Contracting Officer for USAID/Malawi and no date has been set for the transfer. In this R4, RCSA is requesting an additional USDH FTE if USAID/Malawi and USAID/Zambia contracting services are not transferred by the end of fiscal year 1998.

Even if an additional Contracting USDH is approved for RCSA or the transfer takes place, RCSA would still require the services of a USPSC Contracting Officer for two years.

This USPSC would assist in preparing for the transfer, clear the existing backlog of pending contracting actions, catch-up on post award contract administration, assist in resolving several material internal control deficiencies as well as deficiencies identified in a 1996 procurement system review conducted by USAID/W (e.g., contract closeout), and assist in the training of inexperienced local staff.

RCSA has not identified any material Year 2000 problems specific to this Mission. RCSA has augmented our budget for routine up-grading and replacement of ADP software

and hardware, and believe it will be adequate. If USAID/W determines that these are additional unforeseen requirements, then additional budget resources would also be required.

Projected ICASS costs for 1998 are \$83,906 for OE and \$88,530 for programs. There are no plans to obtain any additional services or provide services to others under ICASS. These costs have been straight-lined through 2000, in accordance with the guidance. However, no final billing has been received by ICASS for FY 1998 and additional resources may be required when the final calculations are made.

There are no unfunded accrued liability under the voluntary foreign national separation account requirements. The FSN retirement plan is managed by a local insurance company and is funded by contributions made each pay period. Employees covered under a predecessor retirement plan were fully funded in prior years through payments to the voluntary foreign national separation account.

# **Annex 1**

## **Program Budget Tables**

## USAID FY 2000 BUDGET REQUEST BY PROGRAM/COUNTRY

18-Aug-98  
10:44 AMCountry/Program: USAID/REGIONAL CENTER FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA  
Scenario: Base Level

S.O. #, Title		FY 2000															Future Cost (POST 2000)	Year of Final Oblig.
Approp. Acct	Bilateral/Field Support	Est. SO Pipeline End of FY 99	Estimated Total	Basic Education	Agric.	Other Growth	Pop	Child Survival	Infectious Diseases	HIV/AIDS	Other Health	Environ	D/G	Est. Expend. FY 00	Est. Total Cost life of SO			
SO 1: INCREASED REGIONAL CAPACITY TO INFLUENCE DEMOCRATIC PERFORMANCE																		
DA	Bilateral	5,429	3,000										3,000			12,000	2003	
	Field Spt		0															
Total		5,429	3,000	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	3,000	3,280	28,250	12,000		
SO 1: INCREASED REGIONAL CAPACITY TO INFLUENCE DEMOCRATIC PERFORMANCE																		
DFA	Bilateral	54	0													0	1996	
	Field Spt		0															
Total		54	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0	54	3,936	0		
SO 2: A MORE INTEGRATED REGIONAL MARKET																		
DA	Bilateral	35,433	15,000			15,000										48,000	2003	
	Field Spt		0													0		
Total		35,433	15,000	0		15,000	0	0		0	0	0	0	25,900	137,725	48,000		
SO 2: A MORE INTEGRATED REGIONAL MARKET																		
DFA	Bilateral	1,474	0									0				0	1997	
	Field Spt		0															
Total		1,474	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0	1,474	56,650	0		
SO 2: A MORE INTEGRATED REGIONAL MARKET																		
ESF	Bilateral	1,000															1999	
	Field Spt																	
Total		1,000	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0	1,000	2,000	0		
SO 3: ACCELERATED REGIONAL ADOPTION OF SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT APPROACHES																		
DA	Bilateral	17,032	7,900		4,000							3,900				36,000	2003	
	Field Spt		100									100						
Total		17,032	8,000	0	4,000	0	0	0		0	0	4,000	0	14,750	82,515	36,000		
SO 3: ACCELERATED REGIONAL ADOPTION OF SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT APPROACHES																		
DFA	Bilateral	110	0													0	1997	
	Field Spt		0															
Total		110	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0	110	10,100	0		
SpO A: INCREASED REGIONAL CAPACITY TO MANAGE TRANSBOUNDARY NATURAL RESOURCES																		
DA	Bilateral	1,600	3,000									3,000				18,000	2003	
	Field Spt		0															
Total		1,600	3,000	0		0	0	0		0	0	3,000	0	1,500	28,000	18,000		
Total Bilateral					0		0	0		0	0							
Total Field Support			0		0		0	0		0	0		0					
TOTAL PROGRAM					0		0	0		0	0							

<b>FY 2000 Request Sector Totals -- DA</b>	
Econ Growth	
[Of which Microenterprise]	0
HCD	
PHN	0
Environment	
[Of which Biodiversity]	
Democracy	
Humanitarian	0

<b>FY 2000 Request Sector Totals -- ESF</b>	
Econ Growth	0
[Of which Microenterprise]	0
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
[Of which Biodiversity]	0
Democracy	0
Humanitarian	0

FY 2001 Target Program Level	40,000
FY 2002 Target Program Level	40,000
FY 2003 Target Program Level	40,000

## USAID FY 1999 Budget Request by Program/Country

18-Aug-98  
10:44 AMCountry/Program:  
Scenario: Base Level

S.O. # , Title	FY 1999																	Future Cost (POST 2000)	Year of Final Oblig.	
	Approp. Acct	Bilateral/Field Support	Est. SO Pipeline End of FY 98	Estimated Total	Basic Education	Agric.	Other Growth	Pop	Child Survival	Infectious Diseases	HIV/AIDS	Other Health	Environ	D/G	Est. Expend. FY 99	Est. Total Cost life of SO				
SO 1: INCREASED REGIONAL CAPACITY TO INFLUENCE DEMOCRATIC PERFORMANCE																				
DA	Bilateral	5,644	3,000										3,000				12,000	2003		
	Field Spt		0																	
	Total	5,644	3,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,000	3,215	28,250		12,000			
SO 1: INCREASED REGIONAL CAPACITY TO INFLUENCE DEMOCRATIC PERFORMANCE																				
DFA	Bilateral	354	0														0	1996		
	Field Spt		0																	
	Total	354	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	300	3,936		0			
SO 2: A MORE INTEGRATED REGIONAL MARKET																				
DA	Bilateral	43,860	15,000			15,000											48,000	2003		
	Field Spt		0														0			
	Total	43,860	15,000	0	0	15,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24,427	137,725		48,000			
SO 2: A MORE INTEGRATED REGIONAL MARKET																				
DFA	Bilateral	20,160	0										0				0	1997		
	Field Spt		0																	
	Total	20,160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18,686	56,650		0			
SO 2: A MORE INTEGRATED REGIONAL MARKET																				
ESF	Bilateral		2,000			2,000												1999		
	Field Spt																			
	Total	0	2,000	0	0	2,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,000	2,000		0			
SO 3: ACCELERATED REGIONAL ADOPTION OF SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT APPROACHES																				
DA	Bilateral	23,501	7,800		1,900								5,900				36,000	2003		
	Field Spt		200										200							
	Total	23,501	8,000	0	1,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,100	0	14,469	82,515	36,000			
SO 3: ACCELERATED REGIONAL ADOPTION OF SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT APPROACHES																				
DFA	Bilateral	1,597	0														0	1997		
	Field Spt		0																	
	Total	1,597	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,487	10,100		0			
SpO A: INCREASED REGIONAL CAPACITY TO MANAGE TRANSBOUNDARY NATURAL RESOURCES																				
DA	Bilateral	950	2,000										2,000				18,000	2003		
	Field Spt		0																	
	Total	950	2,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,000	0	1,350	28,000	18,000			
Total Bilateral					0			0	0		0	0								
Total Field Support			0			0		0	0		0	0	200	0						
TOTAL PROGRAM					0			0	0		0	0								

<b>FY 1999 Request Sector Totals -- DA</b>	
Econ Growth	
[Of which Microenterprise]	
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	
[Of which Biodiversity]	
Democracy	
Humanitarian	0

<b>FY 1999 Request Sector Totals -- ESF</b>	
Econ Growth	0
[Of which Microenterprise]	
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
[Of which Biodiversity]	
Democracy	0
Humanitarian	0

FY 2001 Target Program Level	40,000
FY 2002 Target Program Level	40,000
FY 2003 Target Program Level	40,000



## USAID FY 1998 Budget Request by Program/Country

18-Aug-98  
10:44 AMCountry/Program:  
Scenario: Base Level

S.O. # , Title		FY 1998															Future Cost (POST 2000)	Year of Final Oblig.		
Approp. Acct	Bilateral/Field Support	Est. SO Pipeline End of FY 97	Estimated Total	Basic Education	Agric.	Other Growth	Pop	Child Survival	Infectious Diseases	HIV/AIDS	Other Health	Environ	D/G	Est. Expend. FY 98	Est. Total Cost life of SO					
SO 1: INCREASED REGIONAL CAPACITY TO INFLUENCE DEMOCRATIC PERFORMANCE																				
DA	Bilateral Field Spt	3,639	3,000 0										3,000				12,000	2003		
Total		3,639	3,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,000	995	28,250		12,000			
SO 1: INCREASED REGIONAL CAPACITY TO INFLUENCE DEMOCRATIC PERFORMANCE																				
DFA	Bilateral Field Spt	3,280	0 0														0	1996		
Total		3,280	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,926	3,936		0			
SO 2: A MORE INTEGRATED REGIONAL MARKET																				
DA	Bilateral Field Spt	36,656	15,510 490			15,510 490											48,000 0	2003		
Total		36,656	16,000	0	0	16,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,114	137,725		48,000			
SO 2: A MORE INTEGRATED REGIONAL MARKET																				
DFA	Bilateral Field Spt	45,973	0 0									0					0	1997		
Total		45,973	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25,813	56,650		0			
SO 3: ACCELERATED REGIONAL ADOPTION OF SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT APPROACHES																				
DA	Bilateral Field Spt	20,303	7,800 200		3,000							4,800 200					36,000 0	2003		
Total		20,303	8,000	0	3,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,000	0	4,552	82,515		36,000			
SO 3: ACCELERATED REGIONAL ADOPTION OF SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT APPROACHES																				
DFA	Bilateral Field Spt	6,792	0 0														0	1997		
Total		6,792	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,195	10,100		0			
SpO A: INCREASED REGIONAL CAPACITY TO MANAGE TRANSBOUNDARY NATURAL RESOURCES																				
DA	Bilateral Field Spt		1,495 505									1,495 505					18,000 0	2003		
Total		0	2,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,000	0	1,050	28,000		18,000			
SpO B: CREATE CAPACITY FOR MORE INFORMED REGIONAL DECISION MAKING																				
DA	Bilateral Field Spt		1,000 0			1,000											6,000 0	2003		
Total		0	1,000	0	0	1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		10,000		6,000			
Total Bilateral			116,643	28,805	0	3,000	16,510	0	0	0	0	6,295	3,000							
Total Field Support			0	1,195	0	0	490	0	0	0	0	705	0							
TOTAL PROGRAM			116,643	30,000	0	3,000	17,000	0	0	0	0	7,000	3,000				120,000			

<b>FY 1998 Request Sector Totals -- DA</b>		
Econ Growth	20,000	
[Of which Microenterpris]		
HCD	0	
PHN	0	
Environment	7,000	
[Of which Biodiversity]	5,700	
Democracy	3,000	
Humanitarian	0	

<b>FY 1998 Request Sector Totals -- ESF</b>		
Econ Growth	0	
[Of which Microenterprise]		
HCD	0	
PHN	0	
Environment	0	
[Of which Biodiversity]		
Democracy	0	
Humanitarian	0	

FY 2001 Target Program Level	40,000
FY 2002 Target Program Level	40,000
FY 2003 Target Program Level	40,000

## USAID FY 2000 BUDGET REQUEST BY PROGRAM/COUNTRY

18-Aug-98  
10:44 AMCountry/Program: USAID/REGIONAL CENTER FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA  
Scenario: Base Level

S.O. #, Title		Bilateral/Field Support	Est. SO Pipeline End of FY 99	Estimated Total	FY 2000										Est. Total Cost life of SO	Future Cost (POST 2000)	
Approp. Acct					Basic Education	Agric.	Other Growth	Pop	Child Survival	Infectious Diseases	HIV/AIDS	Other Health	Environ	D/G			
SpO B: CREATE CAPACITY FOR MORE INFORMED REGIONAL DECISION MAKING																	
DA	Bilateral	3,000	1,000			1,000										6,000	2003
	Field Spt		0														
	Total	3,000	1,000	0	0	1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,050	10,000	6,000	
	Bilateral		0													0	
	Field Spt		0													0	
	Total		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
	Bilateral		0													0	
	Field Spt		0													0	
	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
	Bilateral		0													0	
	Field Spt		0													0	
	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
	Bilateral		0													0	
	Field Spt		0													0	
	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
	Bilateral		0													0	
	Field Spt		0													0	
	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
	Bilateral		0													0	
	Field Spt		0													0	
	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	
Total Bilateral		65,132	29,900	0	4,000	16,000	0	0		0	0	6,900	3,000			120,000	
Total Field Support		0	100	0		0	0	0		0	0	100	0				
TOTAL PROGRAM		65,132	30,000	0	4,000	16,000	0	0	0	0	0	7,000	3,000				

## FY 2000 Request Sector Totals -- DA

Econ Growth	20,000
[Of which Microenterprise]	0
HCD	
PHN	0
Environment	7,000
[Of which Biodiversity]	5,000
Democracy	3,000
Humanitarian	0

## FY 2000 Request Sector Totals -- ESF

Econ Growth	0
[Of which Microenterprise]	0
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	0
[Of which Biodiversity]	0
Democracy	0
Humanitarian	0

## FY 2001 Target Program Level

FY 2002 Target Program Level

FY 2003 Target Program Level

40,000

40,000

40,000

Program Funding

USAID FY 1999 Budget Request by Program/Country

18-Aug-98  
10:44 AM

Country/Program:  
Scenario: Base Level

S.O. # , Title		FY 1999															Future Cost (POST 2000)	Year of Final Oblig.
Approp. Acct	Bilateral/Field Support	Est. SO Pipeline End of FY 98	Estimated Total	Basic Education	Agric.	Other Growth	Pop	Child Survival	Infectious Diseases	HIV/AIDS	Other Health	Environ	D/G	Est. Expend. FY 99	Est. Total Cost life of SO			
SpO B: CREATE CAPACITY FOR MORE INFORMED REGIONAL DECISION MAKING																		
DA	Bilateral Field Spt	1,000	2,000			2,000											6,000	2003
	Total	1,000	2,000	0		2,000	0	0		0	0	0	0		10,000		6,000	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0									0					0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0									0					0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0														0	
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	
	Bilateral Field Spt		0							</								

Program Funding

USAID FY 1998 Budget Request by Program/Country

18-Aug-98  
10:44 AM

Country/Program:  
Scenario: Base Level

S.O. # , Title		FY 1998															Future Cost (POST 2000)	Year of Final Oblig.
Approp. Acct	Bilateral/Field Support	Est. SO Pipeline End of FY 97	Estimated Total	Basic Education	Agric.	Other Growth	Pop	Child Survival	Infectious Diseases	HIV/AIDS	Other Health	Environ	D/G	Est. Expend. FY 98	Est. Total Cost life of SO			
	Bilateral Field Spt		0															
	Total	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt		0															
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		
	Bilateral Field Spt																	
	Total	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0			0		

## **Annex 2**

### **Field Support Table**

## GLOBAL FIELD SUPPORT

Objective Name	Field Support: Activity Title & Number	Priority *	Duration	Estimated Funding (\$000)					
				FY 1998 Obligated by:		FY 1999 Obligated by:		FY 2000 Obligated by:	
				Operating Unit	Global Bureau	Operating Unit	Global Bureau	Operating Unit	Global Bureau
SO 2 - A More Integrated Regional Market	Private Enterprise Development Services 936-0026 or SEGIR	Medium	Eight Weeks	400					
SO 2 - A More Integrated Regional Market	Private Enterprise Development Services 936-0026 or SEGIR	High	Two Weeks	90					
SO 3 - Accelerated Regional Adoption of Sustainable Ag/NRM Resource Mgt Approaches	Environmental Policy	Medium-High	Eighteen Months			200		100	
SpO A - Increased Regional Capacity to Manage Transboundary Natural Resources	Innovative Scientific Research II 936-5600	High	One Year		175				
SpO A - Increased Regional Capacity to Manage Transboundary Natural Resources	Conservation of Biological Diversity 936-5554	High	Up to 16 Months		330				
<b>GRAND TOTAL.....</b>				<b>490</b>	<b>505</b>	<b>200</b>		<b>100</b>	

\* For Priorities use high, medium-high, medium, medium-low, low

## **Annex 3**

### **OE Budget Tables**

Org. Title:		Overseas Mission Budgets														
Org. No:																
OC		FY 1998			FY 1999 Target			FY 1999 Request			FY 2000 Target			FY 2000 Request		
		Dollars	TF	Total	Dollars	TF	Total	Dollars	TF	Total	Dollars	TF	Total	Dollars	TF	Total
11.1	Personnel compensation, full-time permanent	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
11.1	Base Pay & pymt. for annual leave balances - FNDH	38.9		38.9	40.2		40.2	40.2		40.2	41.3		41.3	41.3		41.3
	Subtotal OC 11.1	38.9	0	38.9	40.2	0	40.2	40.2	0	40.2	41.3	0	41.3	41.3	0	41.3
11.3	Personnel comp. - other than full-time permanent	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
11.3	Base Pay & pymt. for annual leave balances - FNDH	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
	Subtotal OC 11.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11.5	Other personnel compensation	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
11.5	USDH	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
11.5	FNDH	5		5	5.1		5.1	5.1		5.1	5.3		5.3	5.3		5.3
	Subtotal OC 11.5	5	0	5	5.1	0	5.1	5.1	0	5.1	5.3	0	5.3	5.3	0	5.3
11.8	Special personal services payments	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
11.8	USPSC Salaries	336.5		336.5	346.5		346.5	532.8		532.8	356.8		356.8	548.7		548.7
11.8	FN PSC Salaries	564.7		564.7	581.6		581.6	622.9		622.9	599		599	641.6		641.6
11.8	IPA/Details-In/PASAs/RSSAs Salaries	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
	Subtotal OC 11.8	901.2	0	901.2	928.1	0	928.1	1155.7	0	1155.7	955.8	0	955.8	1190.3	0	1190.3
12.1	Personnel benefits	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
12.1	USDH benefits	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
12.1	Educational Allowances	48.3		48.3	66.5		66.5	66.5		66.5	69.1		69.1	69.1		69.1
12.1	Cost of Living Allowances	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
12.1	Home Service Transfer Allowances	1		1	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
12.1	Quarters Allowances	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
12.1	Other Misc. USDH Benefits	15		15	3		3	3		3	5		5	5		5
12.1	FNDH Benefits	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
12.1	Payments to the FSN Separation Fund - FNDH	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
12.1	Other FNDH Benefits	4.9		4.9	5.1		5.1	5.1		5.1	5.2		5.2	5.2		5.2
12.1	US PSC Benefits	31		31	32		32	94.3		94.3	32.8		32.8	75.6		75.6
12.1	FN PSC Benefits	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
12.1	Payments to the FSN Separation Fund - FN PSC	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
12.1	Other FN PSC Benefits	45.7		45.7	47		47	51.3		51.3	48.4		48.4	52.9		52.9
12.1	IPA/Detail-In/PASA/RSSA Benefits	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
	Subtotal OC 12.1	145.9	0	145.9	153.6	0	153.6	220.2	0	220.2	160.5	0	160.5	207.8	0	207.8
13	Benefits for former personnel	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
13	FNDH	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
13	Severance Payments for FNDH	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
13	Other Benefits for Former Personnel - FNDH	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
13	FN PSCs	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
13	Severance Payments for FN PSCs	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
13	Other Benefits for Former Personnel - FN PSCs	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
	Subtotal OC 13.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21	Travel and transportation of persons	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
21	Training Travel	53		53	44.3		44.3	44.3		44.3	31.8		31.8	31.8		31.8
21	Mandatory/Statutory Travel	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
21	Post Assignment Travel - to field	27.5		27.5	32.8		32.8	32.8		32.8	26.6		26.6	26.6		26.6



Org. Title:		Overseas Mission Budgets														
Org. No:																
OC		FY 1998			FY 1999 Target			FY 1999 Request			FY 2000 Target			FY 2000 Request		
		Dollars	TF	Total	Dollars	TF	Total	Dollars	TF	Total	Dollars	TF	Total	Dollars	TF	Total
21	Assignment to Washington Travel	8.4		8.4	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
21	Home Leave Travel	15.6		15.6	62.5		62.5	62.5		62.5	91.5		91.5	91.5		91.5
21	R & R Travel	52.2		52.2	65		65	65		65	51.7		51.7	51.7		51.7
21	Education Travel	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
21	Evacuation Travel	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
21	Retirement Travel	17.6		17.6	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
21	Pre-Employment Invitational Travel	2.4		2.4	2.5		2.5	2.5		2.5	2.6		2.6	2.6		2.6
21	Other Mandatory/Statutory Travel	20		20	12.3		12.3	12.3		12.3	10		10	10		10
21	Operational Travel	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
21	Site Visits - Headquarters Personnel	60		60	30.9		30.9	30.9		30.9	31.8		31.8	31.8		31.8
21	Site Visits - Mission Personnel	210		210	222.5		222.5	222.5		222.5	229.1		229.1	229.1		229.1
21	Conferences/Seminars/Meetings/Retreats	50		50	51.5		51.5	51.5		51.5	47.7		47.7	47.7		47.7
21	Assessment Travel	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
21	Impact Evaluation Travel	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
21	Disaster Travel (to respond to specific disasters)	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
21	Recruitment Travel	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
21	Other Operational Travel	36		36	37.1		37.1	37.1		37.1	39.9		39.9	39.9		39.9
	Subtotal OC 21.0	552.7	0	552.7	561.4	0	561.4	561.4	0	561.4	562.7	0	562.7	562.7	0	562.7
22	Transportation of things	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
22	Post assignment freight	75		75	61.8		61.8	61.8		61.8	47.7		47.7	47.7		47.7
22	Home Leave Freight	9		9	15.4		15.4	15.4		15.4	22.3		22.3	22.3		22.3
22	Retirement Freight	35		35	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
22	Transportation/Freight for Office Furniture/Equip.	15		15	15		15	15		15	15		15	15		15
22	Transportation/Freight for Res. Furniture/Equip.	15		15	15		15	15		15	15		15	15		15
	Subtotal OC 22.0	149	0	149	107.2	0	107.2	107.2	0	107.2	100	0	100	100	0	100
23.2	Rental payments to others	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
23.2	Rental Payments to Others - Office Space	190.3		190.3	190.3		190.3	190.3		190.3	190.3		190.3	190.3		190.3
23.2	Rental Payments to Others - Warehouse Space	31.2		31.2	31.2		31.2	31.2		31.2	33.1		33.1	33.1		33.1
23.2	Rental Payments to Others - Residences	159.5		159.5	160		160	185.6		185.6	165		165	200.3		200.3
	Subtotal OC 23.2	381	0	381	381.5	0	381.5	407.1	0	407.1	388.4	0	388.4	423.7	0	423.7
23.3	Communications, utilities, and miscellaneous charges	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
23.3	Office Utilities	41.1		41.1	42.4		42.4	42.4		42.4	43.6		43.6	43.6		43.6
23.3	Residential Utilities	63		63	64.8		64.8	64.8		64.8	66.9		66.9	66.9		66.9
23.3	Telephone Costs	62.8		62.8	64.7		64.7	64.7		64.7	66.6		66.6	66.6		66.6
23.3	ADP Software Leases	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
23.3	ADP Hardware Lease	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
23.3	Commercial Time Sharing	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
23.3	Postal Fees (Other than APO Mail)	0.5		0.5	0.5		0.5	0.5		0.5	0.5		0.5	0.5		0.5
23.3	Other Mail Service Costs	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
23.3	Courier Services	10		10	10.3		10.3	10.3		10.3	10.6		10.6	10.6		10.6
	Subtotal OC 23.3	177.4	0	177.4	182.7	0	182.7	182.7	0	182.7	188.2	0	188.2	188.2	0	188.2
24	Printing and Reproduction	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
	Subtotal OC 24.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25.1	Advisory and assistance services	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		

Org. Title:		RCSA		Overseas Mission Budgets													
Org. No:		690															
OC		FY 1998			FY 1999 Target			FY 1999 Request			FY 2000 Target			FY 2000 Request			
		Dollars	TF	Total	Dollars	TF	Total	Dollars	TF	Total	Dollars	TF	Total	Dollars	TF	Total	
25.1	Studies, Analyses, & Evaluations	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	
25.1	Management & Professional Support Services	45		45	30.9		30.9	30.9		30.9	31.8		31.8	31.8		31.8	
25.1	Engineering & Technical Services	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	
	Subtotal OC 25.1	45	0	45	30.9	0	30.9	30.9	0	30.9	31.8	0	31.8	31.8	0	31.8	
25.2	Other services	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			
25.2	Office Security Guards	24.9		24.9	25.7		25.7	25.7		25.7	26.4		26.4	26.4		26.4	
25.2	Residential Security Guard Services	19		19	19.4		19.4	19.4		19.4	20		20	20		20	
25.2	Official Residential Expenses	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	
25.2	Representation Allowances	1.6		1.6	1.6		1.6	1.6		1.6	1.6		1.6	1.6		1.6	
25.2	Non-Federal Audits	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	
25.2	Grievances/Investigations	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	
25.2	Insurance and Vehicle Registration Fees	1.7		1.7	1.7		1.7	1.7		1.7	1.8		1.8	1.8		1.8	
25.2	Vehicle Rental	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	
25.2	Manpower Contracts	30		30	72.1		72.1	72.1		72.1	74.3		74.3	74.3		74.3	
25.2	Records Declassification & Other Records Services	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	
25.2	Recruiting activities	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	
25.2	Penalty Interest Payments	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	
25.2	Other Miscellaneous Services	20		20	20.6		20.6	20.6		20.6	21.2		21.2	21.2		21.2	
25.2	Staff training contracts	40		40	41.2		41.2	41.2		41.2	42.4		42.4	42.4		42.4	
25.2	ADP related contracts	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	
	Subtotal OC 25.2	137.2	0	137.2	182.3	0	182.3	182.3	0	182.3	187.7	0	187.7	187.7	0	187.7	
25.3	Purchase of goods and services from Government accounts	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			
25.3	ICASS	84		84	84		84	84		84	84		84	84		84	
25.3	All Other Services from Other Gov't. accounts	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	
	Subtotal OC 25.3	84	0	84	84	0	84	84	0	84	84	0	84	84	0	84	
25.4	Operation and maintenance of facilities	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			
25.4	Office building Maintenance	40		40	30.9		30.9	30.9		30.9	31.8		31.8	31.8		31.8	
25.4	Residential Building Maintenance	110		110	72.1		72.1	72.1		72.1	74.5		74.5	74.5		74.5	
	Subtotal OC 25.4	150	0	150	103	0	103	103	0	103	106.3	0	106.3	106.3	0	106.3	
25.6	Medical Care	2		2	2		2	2		2	2.1		2.1	2.1		2.1	
	Subtotal OC 25.6	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2.1	0	2.1	2.1	0	2.1	
25.7	Operation/maintenance of equipment & storage of goods	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			
25.7	ADP and telephone operation and maintenance costs	2		2	2.1		2.1	2.1		2.1	2.1		2.1	2.1		2.1	
25.7	Storage Services	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	
25.7	Office Furniture/Equip. Repair and Maintenance	20		20	20.6		20.6	20.6		20.6	21.2		21.2	21.2		21.2	
25.7	Vehicle Repair and Maintenance	30		30	30.9		30.9	30.9		30.9	31.8		31.8	31.8		31.8	
25.7	Residential Furniture/Equip. Repair and Maintenance	2		2	2.1		2.1	2.1		2.1	2.1		2.1	2.1		2.1	
	Subtotal OC 25.7	54	0	54	55.7	0	55.7	55.7	0	55.7	57.2	0	57.2	57.2	0	57.2	
25.8	Subsistence and support of persons (by contract or Government)	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	
	Subtotal OC 25.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
26	Supplies and materials	55.7		55.7	56.3		56.3	56.5		56.5	52.7		52.7	55.6		55.6	

Org. Title: Org. No: OC		Overseas Mission Budgets														
RCSA 690		FY 1998			FY 1999 Target			FY 1999 Request			FY 2000 Target			FY 2000 Request		
		Dollars	TF	Total	Dollars	TF	Total	Dollars	TF	Total	Dollars	TF	Total	Dollars	TF	Total
Subtotal OC 26.0		55.7	0	55.7	56.3	0	56.3	56.5	0	56.5	52.7	0	52.7	55.6	0	55.6
31	Equipment	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
31	Purchase of Residential Furniture/Equip.	55		55	60		60	60		60	35		35	35		35
31	Purchase of Office Furniture/Equip.	40		40	25		25	25		25	25		25	25		25
31	Purchase of Vehicles	30		30	40		40	40		40	30		30	30		30
31	Purchase of Printing/Graphics Equipment	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
31	ADP Hardware purchases	60		60	65		65	65		65	60		60	60		60
31	ADP Software purchases	20		20	20		20	20		20	10		10	10		10
Subtotal OC 31.0		205	0	205	210	0	210	210	0	210	160	0	160	160	0	160
32	Lands and structures	Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line			Do not enter data on this line		
32	Purchase of Land & Buildings (& construction of bldg	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
32	Purchase of fixed equipment for buildings	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
32	Building Renovations/Alterations - Office	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
32	Building Renovations/Alterations - Residential	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
Subtotal OC 32.0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
42	Claims and indemnities	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
Subtotal OC 42.0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL BUDGET		3084	0	3084	3084	0	3084	3404	0	3404	3084	0	3084	3404	0	3404
Dollars Used for Local Currency Purchases		<u>1900</u>			<u>1900</u>			<u>2000</u>			<u>1900</u>			<u>2000</u>		
Exchange Rate Used in Computations		3.85 _____			3.85 _____			3.85 _____			3.85 _____			3.85 _____		
Workyears of Effort 1/																
FNDH		2		2	2		2	2		2	2		2	2		2
FN PSCs		45.5		45.5	48		48	48		48	48		48	48		48
IPAs/Details-In		0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0
Manpower Contracts		4		4	13		13	13		13	13		13	13		13
Total Workyears		51.5	0	51.5	63	0	63	63	0	63	63	0	63	63	0	63

1/ One workyear of effort is equal to 2080 hours worked.

## **Annex 4**

### **Workforce Tables**

Workforce

Org. USAID/RCSA FY 1998 On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff						Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SpO 1	SpO 2	SpO 3	Org. Mgmt.	Con- troller	AMS/ EXO	Con- tract	Legal	All Other		
U.S. Direct Hire	1	1	1.5		0.5	1	5	2	2	1	2	2	2	11	16
Other U.S. Citizens: 1/ OE Internationally Recruited							0			1				1	1
OE Locally Recruited Program		2.5	1.5				4	1	1	2	2			6 0	6 4
FNS/TCN Direct Hire: OE Internationally Recruited							0							0	0
OE Locally Recruited							0		2					2	2
FNS/TCN Non-Direct Hire: OE Internationally Recruited							0		1					1	1
OE Locally Recruited Program	2.5	5	2.5		1	0.5	11		8	30	4	1	4.5	47.5 0	49 11
Total Staff Levels	3.5	8.5	6.5	0	1.5	1.5	0	3	14	34	8	3	6.5	68.5	90
TAACS							0							0	0
Fellows					1		1							0	1

1/ Excluding TAACS and Fellows

Workforce

Org. USAID/RCSA FY 1999 Target On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff							Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SpO 1	SpO 2	SpO 3		Org. Mgmt.	Con- troller	AMS/ EXO	Con- tract	Legal	All Other		
U.S. Direct Hire		1	1.5		1.5	1		5	2	2	1	2	2	2	11	16
Other U.S. Citizens: 1/ OE Internationally Recruited OE Locally Recruited Program								0 0 3	1	1	1 2	2			1 6 0	1 6 3
FSN/TCN Direct Hire: OE Internationally Recruited OE Locally Recruited								0 0		2					0 2	0 2
FSN/TCN Non-Direct Hire: OE Internationally Recruited OE Locally Recruited Program								0 1.5 13		1 8		30	4	1 4.5	1 47.5 0	1 49 13
	2.5	5	3.5		1	1										
Total Staff Levels	2.5	8.5	6.5	0	2.5	2.5	0	22.5	3	14	34	8	3	6.5	68.5	91
TAACS Fellows					1			0 1							0 0	0 1

1/ Excluding TAACS and Fellows

Org. USAID/RCSA FY 1999 Request On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff							Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SpO 1	SpO 2	SpO 3		Org. Mgmt.	Con- troller	AMS/ EXO	Con- tract	Legal	All Other		
U.S. Direct Hire		1	1.5		1.5	1		5	2	2	1	3	2	2	12	17
Other U.S. Citizens: 1/ OE Internationally Recruited OE Locally Recruited Program								0 0 3	1	1	1 2	1 2			2 6 0	2 6 3
FSN/TCN Direct Hire: OE Internationally Recruited OE Locally Recruited								0 0		2					0 2	0 2
FSN/TCN Non-Direct Hire: OE Internationally Recruited OE Locally Recruited Program								0 1.5 13		1 8		30	4	1 4.5	1 47.5 0	1 49 13
	2.5	5	3.5		1	1										
Total Staff Levels	2.5	8.5	6.5	0	2.5	2.5	0	22.5	3	14	34	10	3	6.5	70.5	93
TAACS Fellows					1			0 1							0 0	0 1

1/ Excluding TAACS and Fellows

Workforce

Org. USAID/RCSA FY 2000 Target On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff						Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SpO 1	SpO 2	SpO 3	Org. Mgmt.	Con- troller	AMS/ EXO	Con- tract	Legal	All Other		
U.S. Direct Hire		1	1.5		1.5	1	5	2	2	1	2	2	2	11	16
Other U.S. Citizens: 1/ OE Internationally Recruited OE Locally Recruited Program		2.5	0.5				0 0 3	1	1	1 2	2			1 6 0	1 6 3
FSN/TCN Direct Hire: OE Internationally Recruited OE Locally Recruited							0 0		2					0 2	0 2
FSN/TCN Non-Direct Hire: OE Internationally Recruited OE Locally Recruited Program	2.5	5	1 3.5		0.5 1		0 1.5 13		1 8	30	4	1	4.5	1 47.5 0	1 49 13
Total Staff Levels	2.5	8.5	6.5	0	2.5	2.5	0	3	14	34	8	3	6.5	68.5	91
TAACS Fellows					1		0 1							0 0	0 1

1/ Excluding TAACS and Fellows

Org. USAID/RCSA FY 2000 Request On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff						Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SpO 1	SpO 2	SpO 3	Org. Mgmt.	Con- troller	AMS/ EXO	Con- tract	Legal	All Other		
U.S. Direct Hire		1	1.5		1.5	1	5	2	2	1	3	2	2	12	17
Other U.S. Citizens: 1/ OE Internationally Recruited OE Locally Recruited Program		2.5	0.5				0 0 3	1	1	1 2	1 2			2 6 0	2 6 3
FSN/TCN Direct Hire: OE Internationally Recruited OE Locally Recruited							0 0		2					0 2	0 2
FSN/TCN Non-Direct Hire: OE Internationally Recruited OE Locally Recruited Program	2.5	5	1 3.5		0.5 1		0 1.5 13		1 8	30	4	1	4.5	1 47.5 0	1 49 13
Total Staff Levels	2.5	8.5	6.5	0	2.5	2.5	0	3	14	34	10	3	6.5	70.5	93
TAACS Fellows					1		0 1							0 0	0 1

1/ Excluding TAACS and Fellows

Workforce

Org. USAID/RCSA FY 2001 On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff							Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SpO 1	SpO 2	SpO 3		Org. Mgmt.	Con- troller	AMS/ EXO	Con- tract	Legal	All Other		
U.S. Direct Hire		1	1.5		1.5	1		5	2	2	1	3	2	2	12	17
Other U.S. Citizens: 1/ OE Internationally Recruited OE Locally Recruited Program		2.5	0.5					0 0 3	1	1	1 2	1 2			2 6 0	2 6 3
FSN/TCN Direct Hire: OE Internationally Recruited OE Locally Recruited								0 0		2					0 2	0 2
FSN/TCN Non-Direct Hire: OE Internationally Recruited OE Locally Recruited Program	2.5	5	3.5	1		0.5 1		0 1.5 13		1 8	30	4	1	4.5	1 47.5 0	1 49 13
Total Staff Levels	2.5	8.5	6.5	0	2.5	2.5	0	22.5	3	14	34	10	3	6.5	70.5	93
TAACS Fellows					1			0 1							0 0	0 1

1/ Excluding TAACS and Fellows

Org. USAID/RCSA Summary On-Board Estimate	SO/SpO Staff							Total SO/SpO Staff	Management Staff						Total Mgmt.	Grand Total Staff
	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SpO A	SpO B	SpO 3		Org. Mgmt.	Con- troller	AMS/ EXO	Con- tract	Legal	All Other		
FY 1998:																
U.S. Direct Hire	1	1	1.5	0	0.5	1	0	5	2	2	1	2	2	2	9	16
OE Internationally Recr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	2
OE Locally Recruited	0	0	1	0	0	0.5	0	1.5	1	11	32	6	1	4.5	55.5	57
Total OE Funded Sta	1	1	2.5	0	0.5	1.5	0	6.5	3	14	33	8	3	6.5	66.5	75
Program Funded	2.5	7.5	4	0	1	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Total FY 1998	3.5	8.5	6.5	0	1.5	1.5	0	21.5	3	14	33	8	3	6.5	66.5	90

FY 1999 Target:																
U.S. Direct Hire	0	1	1.5	0	1.5	1	0	5	2	2	1	2	2	2	11	16
OE Internationally Recr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	2
OE Locally Recruited	0	0	1	0	0	0.5	0	1.5	1	11	32	6	1	4.5	55.5	57
Total OE Funded Sta	0	1	2.5	0	1.5	1.5	0	6.5	3	14	34	8	3	6.5	68.5	75
Program Funded	2.5	7.5	4	0	1	1	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Total FY 1999 Target	2.5	8.5	6.5	0	2.5	2.5	0	22.5	3	14	34	8	3	6.5	68.5	91

FY 1999 Request:																
U.S. Direct Hire	0	1	1.5	0	1.5	1	0	5	2	2	1	3	2	2	12	17
OE Internationally Recr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3	3
OE Locally Recruited	0	0	1	0	0	0.5	0	1.5	1	11	32	6	1	4.5	55.5	57
Total OE Funded Sta	0	1	2.5	0	1.5	1.5	0	6.5	3	14	34	10	3	6.5	70.5	77
Program Funded	2.5	7.5	4	0	1	1	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Total FY 1999 Request	2.5	8.5	6.5	0	2.5	2.5	0	22.5	3	14	34	10	3	6.5	70.5	93

FY 2000 Target:																
U.S. Direct Hire	0	1	1.5	0	1.5	1	0	5	2	2	1	2	2	2	11	16
OE Internationally Recr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	2
OE Locally Recruited	0	0	1	0	0	0.5	0	1.5	1	11	32	6	1	4.5	55.5	57
Total OE Funded Sta	0	1	2.5	0	1.5	1.5	0	6.5	3	14	34	8	3	6.5	68.5	75
Program Funded	2.5	7.5	4	0	1	1	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Total FY 2000 Target	2.5	8.5	6.5	0	2.5	2.5	0	22.5	3	14	34	8	3	6.5	68.5	91



Workforce

FY 2000 Request:																
U.S. Direct Hire	0	1	1.5	0	1.5	1	0	5	2	2	1	3	2	2	12	17
OE Internationally Recr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3	3
OE Locally Recruited	0	0	1	0	0	0.5	0	1.5	1	11	32	6	1	4.5	55.5	57
Total OE Funded Sta	0	1	2.5	0	1.5	1.5	0	6.5	3	14	34	10	3	6.5	70.5	77
Program Funded	2.5	7.5	4	0	1	1	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Total FY 2000 Request	2.5	8.5	6.5	0	2.5	2.5	0	22.5	3	14	34	10	3	6.5	70.5	93

FY 2001 Estimate:																
U.S. Direct Hire	0	1	1.5	0	1.5	1	0	5	2	2	1	3	2	2	12	17
OE Internationally Recr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3	3
OE Locally Recruited	0	0	1	0	0	0.5	0	1.5	1	11	32	6	1	4.5	55.5	57
Total OE Funded Sta	0	1	2.5	0	1.5	1.5	0	6.5	3	14	34	10	3	6.5	70.5	77
Program Funded	2.5	7.5	4	0	1	1	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Total FY 2001 Estimate	2.5	8.5	6.5	0	2.5	2.5	0	22.5	3	14	34	10	3	6.5	70.5	93

MISSION : USAID/Regional Center for Southern Africa

USDH STAFFING REQUIREMENTS BY SKILL CODE

BACKSTOP (BS)	NO. OF USDH EMPLOYEES IN BACKSTOP FY 98	NO. OF USDH EMPLOYEES IN BACKSTOP FY 99	NO. OF USDH EMPLOYEES IN BACKSTOP FY 2000	NO. OF USDH EMPLOYEES IN BACKSTOP FY 2001
01SMG	2	2	2	2
02 Program Off.	2	2	2	2
03 EXO	1	1	1	1
04 Controller	2	2	2	2
05/06/07 Secretary				
10 Agriculture.	1	1	1	1
11Economics				
12 GDO				
12 Democracy	1			
14 Rural Dev.				
15 Food for Peace				
21 Private Ent.	1	1	1	1
25 Engineering				
40 Environ		1	1	1
50 Health/Pop.				
60 Education				
75 Physical Sci.				
85 Legal	2	2	2	2
92 Commodity Mgt				
93 Contract Mgt	2	3	3	3
94 PDO	2	2	2	2
95 IDI				
Other*				
TOTAL	16	17	17	17

\*please list occupations covered by other if there are any

# TRUST FUNDS & FSN SEPARATION FUND

Orgno:. 690  
Org. Title: RCSA

## Foreign National Voluntary Separation Account

Action	FY 97			FY 98			FY 99		
	OE	Program	Total	OE	Program	Total	OE	Program	Total
Deposits	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
Withdrawals	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0

Unfunded Liability (if any)  
at the end of each FY.

## Local Currency Trust Funds - Regular (\$000s)

	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99
Balance Start of Year	0.0	0.0	0.0
Obligations	0.0	0.0	0.0
Deposits	0.0	0.0	0.0
Balance End of Year	0.0	0.0	0.0

Exchange Rate(s) Used

## Trust Funds in Dollar Equivalents, not in Local Country Equivalents

## Local Currency Trust Funds - Real Property (\$000s)

	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99
Balance Start of Year	0.0	0.0	0.0
Obligations	0.0	0.0	0.0
Deposits	0.0	0.0	0.0
Balance End of Year	0.0	0.0	0.0

## Trust Funds in Dollar Equivalents, not in Local Country Equivalents